THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 109, NO. 10 NEW YORK, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1943 NUMBER 1501

Exit, Mr. Welles

We do not propose to wring our hands over the dismissal of Mr. Sumner Welles. There is something to be said for putting an end to an intolerable situation of divided authority inside the State Department, and it had become pretty clear that either Mr. Welles or Secretary Hull had to go. Mr. Roosevelt was told by the conservative advisers on whom he now leans so heavily, that he needed Mr. Hull as a liaison man with the Southern conservatives in Congress. The enforced resignation of Mr. Welles therefore becomes another in the President's long series of gestures of appeasement which seem in retrospect to be of such dubious value.

The result is that Mr. Hull, whose weaknesses as an administrator and whose conservative outlook are notorious, is left alone at the head of a department still rent with internal quarrels, confusion, contradictory policies and lack of policy. Mr. Welles was no shining example of democracy in office, but he had grown notably in recent years: he was thoroughly popular throughout Latin America, he had lately been a strong friend of coöperation with Russia and an advocate of a peace settlement on democratic lines. His going makes the outlook on the political front, already a gloomy one, all the more disturbing.

Help for the Jews

The Institute of Jewish Affairs has issued a report on the situation of the Jews in Axis-occupied Europe. Before the war this population numbered about 8,300,000; today only 3,000,000 are left, and Hitler is working as fast as he can to fulfill his announced intention of killing them all. About 3,000,000 have been murdered by one device or another; 1,800,000 have been sent to Russia and 180,000 have emigrated to other lands.

As we pointed out in our special supplement last week, there is no need to fold our hands and let the remaining 3,000,000 Jews be slaughtered. There are four things that could be done at once to rescue many of them. First, let the United Nations threaten retribution to those guilty of crimes against innocent victims, whether Jews or not, and do it in such terms that there will be no doubt they mean it. Second, let the neutral countries of Europe be aided in accepting temporary refugees, with guarantees that food, medicine and clothing will be sent to them for the purpose. Third, reopen the doors of Palestine, where the total number of immigrants permitted (accidentally misstated in our pages last week) is only 75,000 in all, beginning in 1939. Fourth, let Great Britain and the United States permit refugees to enter in substantial numbers, which at present they refuse to do. All these proposals can easily be carried out. If we have not enough native decency, generosity and human kindness to hold out a hand to 3,000,000 people who are about to be murdered, this world is indeed a sorry place.

Trouble in Denmark

The serious situation that has developed in Denmark is final proof, if anybody needed it, that fascism cannot be made to work in an occupied country on any permanent basis. When Denmark was invaded, the Danes sensibly decided not to have their handful of

CONTENTS

The Week 319

Editorials

The Russian Rift 322
Chinese Exclusion 323
How to Behave Abroad 324

General Articles

Roosevelt in 1943 . . . . George Soule 325
Houses of Earth . . . . Robert C. Cook 328
For a Federated Europe . . Albert Guérard 330
Georgia Justice and the FCC . . . . . Willson Whitman 333
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 335
Not So Sound as Furious . . Manny Farber 336
A Communication: Experience and Intelligence . . . . . Sidney Hook 336
The Bandwagon 338

Correspondence 338

Books in Review

The Forster Revival . . George Mayberry 341
Hectic Harlem . . . . Henry Lee Moon 342
We Vote as We Live . . . . George Soule 342
New Wine, Old Bottle . . William Miller 343
Reticent Curmudgeon . Benjamin T. Brooks 344
In Tolerance . . . . . C. Wright Mills 344
A Reader's List 346

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1943, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

troops slaughtered in a hopeless resistance. Ever since, they have done their best to get along somehow or other with the conquerors. But the Germans were insatiable and unendurable, and at last even the Danish patience was exhausted. The demand that the death penalty —long ago abolished in Denmark—be reëstablished for saboteurs proved the breaking point. Presumably part of the sabotage was done by parachutists from England, and some reports suggest that the Germans fear Denmark might be the basis for an invasion. But in any case, the situation is also the illustration of a great truth. Large masses of people will not live permanently without freedom. A certain proportion of them reach a time when they had rather risk death than go on as they are.

Boris of Bulgaria

Reports from Bulgaria, not yet confirmed, say that the illness of which King Boris died was an assassin's bullet. Whatever the cause of his demise, he can have been mourned by very few except possibly Hitler. If anything good could be said of him, we don't know what it was; although Bulgaria's sympathies have always been pro-Russian, he elected to go with the Nazis, possibly on the purely expedient argument that he thought they were going to win. His passing is another blow to Hitler, who has had plenty of them lately.

Russia and European Federation

Russia has served notice, as plainly as she can do within the rules of diplomatic procedure, that she wants no federation of European countries in the post-war world that would be hostile to herself. Her main concern is the plan, put forward chiefly by the Poles, for an East European federation of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Poland. The Russians say bluntly that they do not trust the Poles and do not believe in the good intentions of any such federation of which Poland is a part.

Whatever else our diplomacy may have done during this war, it has failed to convince the hard-headed Russian realists that the Western democracies are willing to find a *modus vivendi* with them. It is perfectly clear that Russia's policy is defensive, not aggressive. She will interfere in European affairs only to the extent that she believes necessary to protect herself from attack. She tried collective security once, only to find that the powers which praised it in public plotted against it in private. She tried appeasement, in the Russo-German treaty which preceded the outbreak of the World War by one week. Now she feels immeasureably stronger *vis-a-vis* Europe than she has ever been. She won't permit any federation to be formed for the purpose of an ultimate attack upon herself. Here is convincing proof either that our diplomats are in fact plotting against Russia, or that they have failed in their most elementary job of convincing her that their intentions are good.

Mr. Kelland's Plan

Mr. C. B. Kelland is a writer of popular fiction. The critics don't seem to like his work, but apparently the public does. He is influential in Republican circles, and has lately published a five-point program for the post-ward period. We summarize and comment on his plank below.

1. The United States, Britain, Russia and China would run the world for some time after the enemy surrenders, acting as trustees of the conquered nations.

This is what is in fact likely to happen. But everything depends of course on how long such trusteeship continues, and the spirit in which it is operated.

2. These powers will act against any nation threatening a breach of the peace.

This is the "international police force" that is contained in almost every plan for the post-war world. It would be much better if operated by a genuine new League of Nations, open to all powers, rather than a mere League of the Victors.

3. If this plan breaks down, let us have a permanent defensive alliance between the United States and Great Britain.

This already exists in fact if not in name, and will probably continue to exist, though it would be better in the framework of a general understanding among all the nations.

4. We should set up a Western Hemisphere League of Nations for mutual aid against any external aggression.

This already exists for all practical purposes and will probably continue.

5. If other protection dissolves, we should have the most powerful fleet in the world, a big army and air force and all necessary bases to guard our shores including even Casablanca and Dakar.

What Mr. Kelland probably means is that we would keep our present armament while we were trying the alternative plans previously mentioned. The trouble is that a nation so equipped might easily look to other countries like an imperialistic power and a danger to them.

In short, Mr. Kelland, with an amazing lack of imagination for a fiction writer, leaves out the most important single element in post-war planning. For what purpose shall these alliances exist? What kind of a world are we looking for? Are we willing to live and let live, to give other people a fair chance? If we are, and if we don't relapse into nihilistic isolationism, it doesn't matter greatly what kind of machinery we create. If we aren't, no machinery will prevent another world war.

Right at the Wrong Time

It is nearly two months ago that Mussolini fell, the news reaching the United States on a Sunday afternoon. The foreign division of the OWI sought in vain to get

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Southern State Normal School Library
Springfield, S. Dak.

into touch with Robert Sherwood, its head, or with any responsible official of the State Department; failing to do so, it broadcast to England a statement that the fall of Mussolini did not change things materially in Italy and it quoted Samuel Grafton, who had called Victor Emanuel "a moronic little king." For these activities President Roosevelt denounced the OWI in the most scathing terms. Just for the record, let us now record that the OWI was 100 percent right and the President 100 percent wrong. Italy for all practical purposes continues just as fascist as it ever was. King Victor remains the same. The worst you can say of the OWI was that it was right at the wrong time—or what then seemed the wrong time.

The Grapes of Wrath

"The Grapes of Wrath" is not to be included among the forty American films to be shown in European countries under the auspices of the OWI. According to Variety, its exclusion has been requested by the State Department because it "depicted a portion of American life that was better left unpublicized." It is further reported that the picture was imported from Sweden into Germany presumably to plug the old Nazi propaganda line about the pluto-democracies. That "The Grapes of Wrath" tells some unpalatable truths about America is undeniable. But that it can be of any real value to the anti-democratic propagandists is extremely doubtful. Apart from the fact that it is an artistic triumph inconceivable under the conditions of fascist "culture," it is deeply imbued with the ideals of democracy. And the very fact that such a picture could be made and shown in America is the best possible propaganda for our cause.

Food Fights for Freedom

"Food Fights for Freedom" is a slogan of which you are destined to hear a great deal before the year is over. Faced with a serious food problem, the government is making plans for an extensive campaign to persuade the people to produce as much food as possible, avoid waste and live up to price and rationing restrictions.

The spread of prosperity revealed as in a lightning flash the fact that millions of people had previously been unable to get the kind of food, and as much food, as they wished. Even today, with consumption so largely increased, there is probably an enormous additional unsatisfied demand that is held in check only by rationing and the shortages.

The civilians of this country, if present expectations are fulfilled, will have only slightly less food than they had from 1935 to 1939. The difference will be mostly sugar—and we eat far too much sugar anyhow, having multiplied our consumption a thousand percent in a couple of generations. The 1939 level, however, is a good deal below the level of the first half of 1943, when millions of people were eating more food and better food than ever before in their lives. If food consumption in any one part of the country got out of hand, other parts would go very hungry indeed. If consumption in the country as a whole got out of hand, we could create a genuine famine. Luckily, neither of these things is likely to happen. A poll of housewives showed that contrary to the hysterical statements of the New-Deal-hating press, 90 percent of the country believes that rationing is working well and is conducted fairly.

Price ceilings are being violated widely, but even this situation is not hopeless. When 250,000 housewives in New Orleans, one-half the city's population, signed personal pledges to avoid black markets and pay only ceiling prices, food prices almost overnight went down 5 percent. Similar pledges will be asked throughout the whole country. In general, the fight on the food front is doing reasonably well, and Americans still are in this regard among the luckiest people on earth.

Westbrook and the Facts

Westbrook Pegler has recently been carrying on a campaign against American merchant seamen, and especially members of the National Maritime Union. His picture of them is of such an undisciplined, drunken, unpatriotic lot of communists that you get the impression it is practically a miracle if any American ship ever gets to sea, or arrives at her destination. Yet on the contrary, an assistant deputy administrator of the War Shipping Administration recently reported there has been only one delay of an American-flag vessel because of crew trouble in the last ten weeks. Query: Where does Mr. Pegler get his facts? Or doesn't he?

Fitzpatrick, in The St. Louis Post-Dispatch

That Little King Doesn't Seem to be Growing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Russian Rift

THE MOST URGENT question in the world, at this moment, is the relation between Soviet Russia on the one hand and Great Britain and the United States on the other. Dispatches from London say that a new conference is projected for the near future at which these three powers are to be represented, Russia perhaps by Molotov. It is of great importance that such a meeting should take place. It is of even greater importance, however, that we should make sure in advance of sufficient fundamental understanding so that the conference will not break down.

To put it bluntly, numerous reliable evidences indicate that Russia does not see eye to eye with her Western Allies on some important points. Whatever may have been the real reason for the recall of Litvinov, its timing was such as to underline Russia's demand upon the Quebec conference for a second front. It may be true, as PM has stated, that Stalin wrote to Roosevelt saying he would be glad to come to the Quebec conference if he were really needed; but the official record shows only a tart comment from Moscow that Russia had not been invited. When we recognized the French Committee of Liberation grudgingly and in a way to gain the maximum ill will of the French, Russia made her recognition about as complete as possible.

Still more significant was the statement from Moscow a few days ago that Russia will not tolerate any federation in Eastern Europe headed by the present Polish government. The Russians believe any such coalition would be hostile to themselves. The warning was accompanied by the flat statement that what Russia has done in the war entitles her to be heard in the future organization of Europe. To be sure, Churchill and Roosevelt have said almost nothing about a federated Europe; but many other people in their countries have done so, and it is generally taken for granted that such a development must be among our peace plans. The conflict with Russia on this point is not quite so bad as it seems; Russia would certainly feel very different about a coalition of genuinely democratic states in the West, a coalition devoted to permanent peace. Nevertheless, if the Allies were working as closely together as they should, a statement like the Russian one would be not only unnecessary, but unthinkable.

And finally, Russia's post-war aims regarding Germany are now clear, and they differ widely from what Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt have said. We demand unconditional surrender; but the Russians have offered the most explicit promises of conditional surrender through the National Committee of Free Germany in Moscow. We say we will have nothing to do with any fascists; Russia says there will be amnesty for all Hitler adherents "who in good time will renounce him and join the movement for a Free Germany."

Most people in this country and in Britain believe that the German army must be destroyed as a condition of permanent peace. But Russia states that she wants a strong German army to be continued. For what purpose? Who knows what dark suspicion of her present allies may now rest in the depths of the Russian mind?

There has been a sudden wave of propaganda in the Western democracies to the effect that Russia is likely to drop out of the war and make a separate peace. We are aware of no single reason for believing that any such thing is even remotely possible. The Russians tried friendship with Germany once and were stabbed in the back. They know that any such arrangement now would be only another armistice to be followed by renewed attack. They know, too, that even without a second front, the democracies have been of enormous help to their war effort and that a separate peace would leave Russia dangerously isolated in relation not only to Germany but to Japan. It is outrageous for us to talk about Russia's dropping out of "our" war when her losses have been, compared with our own, on the order of fifty to one. The Russians are well aware that talk of their making a separate peace comes from elements in the democracies that are and always have been hostile to them. These are the same forces which are spreading the story everywhere that after this war, we shall have to fight Russia herself.

The Russians cannot fail to note the dismissal of Mr. Sumner Welles, the one important advocate of Russian collaboration within the American State Department in recent times. They can hardly have failed to see the significance in the fact that the ultra conservative Mr. Hull, who dislikes Russia almost as much as he dislikes the New Deal, took with him to Quebec as his sole important adviser Mr. James C. Dunn, who is widely known for being anti-Russia, anti-de Gaulle and pro-Vichy. How can Moscow interpret America's refusal for two months to permit a Russian diplomat to travel from London to Algiers to come into contact with the French Commitee for National Liberation? What do they think when they read in the American press that Eduard Benes is being kept in London by British-American influence when he wants to go to Moscow to sign a Czechoslovak-Russian treaty?

Mr. Hull said a few days ago that persons who repeat criticisms about our international policy are giving aid and comfort to the enemy. But far more aid and comfort are given the enemy when our government pursues a policy that makes possible a widening rift among the Allies. If we intend to collaborate reasonably and fairly with Russia, why not say so? Why do we go out of our way to oppose the rising democratic movements of Axis-occupied Europe? Why give preeminent place in our own councils to men who are no-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toriously anti-democratic? And finally, why prolong the war and endanger the peace by the refusal to say what we are fighting for, and to adopt publicly a clear-cut set of war aims compatible with an early victory and lasting peace?

Chinese Exclusion

THE REPEAL OF THE Chinese Exclusion Laws will come up for action when Congress reconvenes. This issue, long a sore spot in our immigration policy, has been forced to the foreground by Japanese propaganda which is daily telling the Chinese that our protestations of friendship are false as hell, since we have given evidence that we don't want them here, will not admit them on a quota basis and deny them the privilege of becoming American citizens.

The Chinese don't need to be told all this. They know about the Exclusion Act which was passed against them, and them alone, more than sixty years ago. They know they are the only nationals who are required to produce a certificate in addition to a visa when they wish to enter this country on a visiting basis. And they know about the indignities to which Chinese have been subjected at our various ports of entry. They have been hurt all these years by harsh and often cruel discriminations against their race, but they would not degrade themselves by making a fuss about it. They are a proud people, a civilized people whose wisdom has taught them patience.

China always has had a profound, almost pathetic faith in America. She had had reason to believe that we are not self-seeking, because of our return of the Boxer indemnity and the good faith we have kept with the Filipinos. China would like to continue to hold to her faith in us. But you cannot continue to insult a friend and expect friendship in return, even if you were to load him up with material benefits such as financial and military assistance.

Dr. Walter Judd, one-time medical missionary in China and now representative from Minnesota in Congress, had this to say when he testified recently before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, which is considering several bills for the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Laws:

> It is too precarious to wait until after the war to deal with this issue. Without China we have absolutely no assurance that we can and will win this war. The risk of waiting is too great. If we do not consider legal, moral or economic reasons, then a decent instinct for self-preservation requires that we remove every possible sore spot in our relations with China. . . . There is such a thing as a breaking point. . . . All wars have ended, and all wars will end, if for no other reason than sheer exhaustion: and the desperate situation of China today is one approaching exhaustion. . . . If at this time of darkness the Japanese should succeed in squeezing China still harder and if America does not have anything more to offer than further promises and only two percent of our Lend-Lease shipments, I do not know how long China can go on alone. . . . The single, most devastating factor is the beginning of the loss of hope; a loss of expectation that what they will eventually get from their efforts will be true freedom and equality; a loss of confidence in the real and ultimate motives of their allies. . . . The most dramatic and hopeful thing imaginable would be the removal by Congress of the discrimination in our immigration laws against the Chinese. . . . By passing this bill to give China an immigration quota on the same basis as other friendly countries, we can prove that America stands for equality and freedom today as always. It would restore confidence. It would rekindle fires of hope in the hearts of billions of Orientals who want to be with us if they are sure it is for their freedom too. It would invigorate and galvanize them into more active effort and resistance, as no amount of pronouncements or Atlantic Charters, or even planes and guns can do. It would be a deed, not just another word.

The bills before the House Immigration Committee are HR 2893 and HR 2942 introduced by Rep. Ed. Gossett of Texas, and HR 3070, introduced a few days before Congress adjourned by Rep. Warren Magnuson of Washington. The three bills are identical in defining three objectives: the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Laws, placing Chinese immigration on a quota basis and making Chinese eligible for securing American citizenship. The first Gossett bill (HR 2893) would limit 75 percent of the quota to Chinese coming directly from China, thus allowing 25 percent to enter from territory outside of China. HR 2942 adds a section providing that for a period of ten years, beginning with July 1, 1941, the quota in the case of any nationality for which a quota has been determined shall be reduced by one-half, but leaving the minimum quota at one hundred. Both these bills call for the abrogation of the treaty of 1881 between China and the United States concerning immigration. The Magnuson bill (HR 3070) omits this last clause of the Gossett bill (HR 2942)—omits mention of abrogation of treaty, and defines the fourteen exclusion laws more specifically (dating from 1882 through 1913). It looks as if this might be the bill which should be backed, although it is still too early to support any one specific bill in view of all that may happen in the course of congressional vicissitudes.

Objections to the repeal movement have been raised by certain uninformed persons who fear an influx of cheap "coolie" labor. As a matter of fact, not more than 107 Chinese a year would come into the country on the quota basis. They would, of course, have to meet all the individual requirements of the present immigration laws, such as literacy, freedom from disease, financial responsibility, and so forth. As to eligibility for citizenship, the Chinese would have to show they were legally admitted for permanent residence, declare their intention and take out first and second papers,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

etc. The Chinese have proven their capacity for assimilation. There is now a fourth generation of Chinese here—descendants of the first immigrants—who are enlisted in the defense of their country, America.

Within the past few months California, the state that originally led the hue and cry for exclusion, has become the guiding star for more enlightened legislation. Its annual encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as well as the State American Legion, have passed resolutions favoring repeal.

As for labor, the CIO has raised its voice for repeal, as have many progressive AFL locals, such as the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union. William Green may be contrary-minded, but it is believed that the individual worker, who is hoping for the reconstruction of China after the war, will favor equality of treatment for the Chinese.

It behooves every American who would preserve his country's reputation for integrity, fair play and fundamental democratic principles, to register his opinion on this issue with his congressional representatives, so that when it comes to a vote in Congress, the will of the nation will makes itself known. It is imperative that a favorable bill should be reported to the House by the Immigration Committee, of which Rep. Samuel Dickstein of New York is Chairman. Letters and telegrams to Mr. Dickstein as well as to one's individual representatives should prove an effective means of certifying that the American public is behind the repeal movement.

How to Behave Abroad

MORRIS L. COOKE, a Philadelphia consulting engineer, has spent much of his time in Washington in recent years and has to his credit a series of notable, though little publicized, jobs for the government. Among these, he was chairman of the Committee which settled the long-standing dispute between United States oil interests and the Mexican government. Probably as a result of that experience, Mr. Cooke recently published in The New York Times a set of suggestions for American business men exploiting resources of other countries. We should like to summarize some of his advice.

An American corporation working in, let us say, a Latin American country must accept the laws of that country. Its profits should bear a reasonable proportion to what it pays out in the Latin American country in wages, royalties and fees. It should not seek monopolistic rights, nor should it force upon the country cartel arrangements for dividing up territory or limiting exports. If natural resources are involved, contracts should be renegotiated at reasonable intervals.

It is desirable to incorporate under the laws of the country involved, and these laws should be observed. Large natural resources should not be kept idle for long periods of time. Royalties paid to the government should be on a sliding scale so that they can be adjusted with changing conditions. Wage scales should be protected and should be increased whenever possible. Collective bargaining is desirable. Natives should be employed to the utmost extent, including supervisory and executive jobs. They should be trained either on the spot or abroad. Foreigners intending to spend their lives in the country should become naturalized.

The exploiting company should make full and candid reports at least annually. Its books and records should be open to local officials. Wherever possible, disputes between itself and the government should be arbitrated. The company should accept all controls of prices, production and exports that are also imposed on native firms. Of scarce materials, exports should be limited so as to leave sufficient quantities in the country. If the company is on a sound financial basis, with a minimum degree of risk, some stock should be sold to the citizens. As far as possible, important decisions affecting the country should be made within its borders and not in New York or London. American officials of the company residing in the country should learn to speak the language, and as far as possible business should be conducted in it.

It is safe to say that if American companies operating in Mexico, for example, had from the beginning lived up to Mr. Cooke's extremely sensible list of suggestions, they would not have had the thirty years of bitter disputes that they experienced. They could save themselves a world of trouble in other Latin American countries if they would now adopt these principles. A good many people are doubtful whether in the long run private commercial exploitation across international boundaries should be permitted at all. Certainly, if private exploitation abroad is to be continued, Mr. Cooke's proposals should constitute the minimum terms on which it is permitted.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, MICHAEL STRAIGHT, STARK YOUNG

Managing Editor: THOMAS SANCTON

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

Assistant Editors: ELIZABETH HULING, GEORGE MAYBERRY, ISAAC ROSENFELD

Contributing Editors: H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, VARIAN FRY, JULIAN HUXLEY, ALFRED KAZIN, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Advertising Manager: E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt in 1943

In order to keep in scale whatever else may be thought about President Roosevelt, it is necessary to begin by recording that he will long be celebrated as the leader under whom the period of reform known as the New Deal was carried through, and who saw, many months before the people as a whole, the necessity of defeating the Axis, by total war if necessary. To this will probably be added that he was in large measure responsible for military victory in one of the toughest conflicts the nation ever faced, by his acceptance of the thesis that we must mobilize overwhelming economic and military power, at whatever risk to civilian comfort and to the administration which had to impose the sacrifices. As far as now can be seen, he will also deserve the credit for his part in choosing extremely able leaders in the field, and in making it possible for them to operate successfully.

There is still some doubt, however, concerning what historians will say about the ultimate outcome of his achievements. Did the New Deal go deep enough to make much permanent difference in the welfare of the people? Will its implications be fulfilled? Will a large part of it, indeed, not be sacrificed to political exigency in dealing wth reactionary forces? Will the peace be won as splendidly as the war?

These are the questions that for some time now have corroded the bright faith of Mr. Roosevelt's progressive supporters. They have accepted the obvious fact that they must favor a fourth term for the President, because he is the only candidate with whom they would have a good chance of winning. But, by electing him, what would they have won? In elementary terms, most of them have assumed that this is the way to keep "our side" in power. But how far does the administration as a whole embody "our side" at present? Assuming victory in the war, is domestic policy going to be determined by men like Mr. Jesse Jones and Mr. Byrnes, and foreign policy by Mr. Hull, or by whoever it is who makes policy decisions in the Department of State? If there is to be national economic planning, is it to be done by the kind of "practical business men" who at the beginning failed to organize production for war, and who have recently made such a mess of the OPA?

The complaints of progressives about Mr. Roosevelt's administration in his third term are in part the exact reverse of the perennial complaints of conservatives. The most recent and most disturbing incident was his action in putting Mr. Wallace in the dog-house, although in foreign affairs the Vice-President has come to represent the progressives' attitude more explicitly than the President himself, and although he was undoubtedly right in his criticism of Secretary Jones. This criticism had been preceded by a long struggle for power by the Board of Economic Warfare against Mr. Jones on one side and the State Department on the other. If the President had seen this issue as most progressives in the administration saw it, he would have resolved the difficulties in favor of Mr. Wallace, long before they became public.

Other instances concern the appeasement policy toward Vichy, Darlan and others tainted with fascism, the failure to defend against conservative attack progressives in the administration and the policies they stood for—symbolized in the retreat of the OPA from Henderson's administration to its present sad state, and the general turning over of power in the war administration from experienced New Dealers (the "professors") to congressional lame ducks and business men, some of whom had opposed the New Deal and everything else the President had seemed to stand for.

Not all the controversies have become public property, but decisions within the administration have again and again failed to satisfy those on the inside who had been attracted to positions of counsel or responsibility, by what they thought was an opportunity for clear-cut, scientific administration in the public interest. Nobody may ever know, for instance, how much the failure of war finance to contribute its essential part in closing the inflationary gap has been due to Secretary Morgenthau and the President's support of him against advisers who are far better technically equipped.

It is often said that these apparent retreats are due to the fact that the President has become so interested in the war that he has lost his feeling for progressive men and measures. But some of the most severe criticisms have come, not only from progressives, but from others who share little with them except the desire to conduct the war itself efficiently. For a long time it was charged that Mr. Roosevelt did not know how to delegate authority, but channeled so many decisions through himself that he was called the chief bottleneck in Washington. He would create and reshuffle agencies without any clear definition of jurisdiction, or, having given a job to one agency, would suddenly entrust similar duties to another, as if he had forgotten what he had done. And he seemed to have a gift for keeping inefficient men on the job while he removed good ones under pressure. All this has been somewhat improved recently, but progressives note with regret that as authority has become sorted out and integrated at a level below the White House, people in whose aims and methods they have no confidence seem in many cases to have risen to power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I should be the last to deny that many of these misgivings are justified, and yet I think the remedy, if there is one, consists in a better analysis of political processes on the part of progressives themselves, and in action by them more fundamental than criticism of specific presidential acts.

When Mr. Roosevelt first succeeded Mr. Hoover in the White House, a keen observer of the national scene privately made the comment: "Isn't it a relief to have a good politician for President!" The key to Mr. Roosevelt is indeed that he is a politician—a politician not in the sense of invidious epithet, but in the sense of the name of the profession skilled in gaining, keeping and wielding political power, often for praiseworthy ends. There was nothing in Mr. Roosevelt's record before he was first elected to indicate that he was a great philosopher of government, an adept in economic thinking, or even an advanced social reformer. It may be remembered, for instance, that in his campaign against Mr. Hoover he made a point of the necessity of balancing the budget, at the same time that he was making all sorts of good promises, the fulfilment of which would surely unbalance it more than ever. What he was doing was not to advance a coördinated policy for the nation, but to try to please as many voters and pressure groups as possible.

It was a virtue in Mr. Roosevelt which Mr. Hoover did not possess, that he knew which way the wind of opinion was blowing and was ready to try to embody in government what the masses of people seemed to want. The New Deal was not planned in the minds of brain-trusters, and still less in Mr. Roosevelt's mind; indeed, there was precious little planning about it, in the sense of a carefully concerted and consistent national program. Much of it was improvised to meet current agitations and demands; those parts which were better planned were so only because their sponsors had given serious effort to developing them before Mr. Roosevelt took them over.

There was at the time a story that Mr. Roosevelt always agreed enthusiastically with his latest caller, even though the opinion expressed was the exact opposite of that held by the preceding visitor. Whether apocryphal or not, this story well illustrated the point that what really interested the President was not ideas, and that his skill was not in executing a large policy with many mutually consistent parts. His natural gift lay rather in gaining the adherence of people who had influence or represented broad popular tendencies and, when these people disagreed with each other, in breaking them all in to pull together as a team. A cynic might have said that it made little difference to Mr. Roosevelt where the team was going as long as he was in the driver's seat. It could justly be replied that under the conditions of his first administration, and to a lesser extent of his second, Mr. Roosevelt allowed the main direction of his driving to be chosen for him by the progressive sentiments of the voters who held the balance of power.

The New Deal itself was full of inconsistencies and frustrations arising from the fact that it was more important to Mr. Roosevelt to make friends and influence people than to achieve any particular objective of social change. The NRA was an outstanding example. The policies of agricultural and unemployment relief, in conjunction with the President's failure seriously to tackle the problem of installing an expansionist policy in industrial production, was another. When a subordinate's carefully devised plans were suddenly wrecked by pressure applied through the President, Mr. Roosevelt's favorite consolation was to point out to him that conservatives usually hold power longer than liberals, because they are bound together by interest and do not allow differences in belief to bother them, whereas liberals always get to quarreling with one another on matters of principle. Implicit in this attitude was the assumption—largely true at the time—that Mr. Roosevelt was indispensable to the liberal cause, regardless of the detailed effectiveness of his administration, because he knew how to keep power.

Those who have wrongly assumed that Mr. Roosevelt is a spotless knight-errant of progressivism have acquired the habit of blaming subordinates for actions which they dislike, and shaking their heads in wonder that the President should allow himself to be so deceived or betrayed. His failing in this respect is often attributed to the amiable fault of too much loyalty to his appointees. As a matter of fact the President can be ruthless toward those who persist in policies which for his own reasons he disapproves. And as a matter of fact he is personally responsible for much more that goes on in his administration than these friendly critics

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often suspect, even if only indirectly because he keeps in office unfit persons who happen to have political influence.

Take foreign policy as an example. Though the facts have never been documented, it is almost certain that the policy of "non-intervention" in Spain was made in the White House and not in Mr. Hull's domain across the alley. Nothing could have been in more glaring contrast with the President's foresight about the danger of Hitlerism and his opposition to the neutrality laws, and yet the current explanations indicate that this was of little moment to him as compared with the importance of conciliating the Catholic vote—there being no important body of votes on the other side which could not be counted on to support him in spite of what he did in this case. Those who think Mr. Hull himself is far from an ideal Secretary of State with whom to face the problems of the modern world forget that he has a high value to Mr. Roosevelt in his ability to get along with Congress, and in his popularity in what might be critical border states.

Mr. Roosevelt cannot be accused of being a poor fighter. He does not spend all his time conciliating opposition. When sure of a majority, he sometimes makes big political capital of the combative instincts of the voters: he has been elected as much by dislike of the enemies he has made as by admiration for his own qualities. Even this, however, is often more a matter of words and of mobilizing ballots than of practical results. Representatives of big business have hated him as much as they might have hated Stalin as President, and yet what he has done has in the long run increased their profits, their power and their security. It was often said in the piping days of peace and depression that his reforms might have got further if he had said less to antagonize business and done more to harness it to public purposes.

This political combat set the pattern of business v. "professors" which has plagued us ever since. Both sides have been deceived by it. Of course, many business men are progressive and do well in governmental administration. The fault in the war management has consisted, not in appointing able administrators like Donald Nelson or Charles E. Wilson to high posts, but in giving power to men with little to recommend them except group pressure. Especially was this the case when business men were set to regulating their own industries—a practice which we knew enough to avoid in the First World War, and which Bernard Baruch warned the President against. Of course, not all professors are progressives, and certainly not all of them are hare-brained idiots. Business could not get along without theorists and experts in its own work, and neither could government. The real job is careful choice of individuals in both categories, and the establishment of an administrative framework in which they can work together.

The fact is that the President is not distinguished by the engineering type of mind and is temperamentally unsympathetic with large-scale advance planning. He is far from capable of being the architect of a new order. He is not even a well trained administrator. But as a democratic politician he responds to the forces which can contribute to the exercise of power, and he is adept in granting enough to this or that pressure group to keep in balance a large and confusing congeries of such forces. The concessions of his administration to expediency in foreign affairs might have been expected in view of similar concessions in domestic affairs. If progressives are to make use of him, they must be able to use the kind of man he is.

It is a legitimate question whether in the exercise of this skill he has not now gone so far in the direction of compromise that he has made unduly difficult of attainment the goals for which progressives have supported him. Every man who makes power a major criterion of action runs the risk of letting other values slip through his fingers. It has often been argued that Mr. Roosevelt would have been as strong politically, or even stronger, if he had been more consistent and had resisted more hostile pressures.

However that may be, it is an undoubted condition of democracy that political skill is essential to any governmental accomplishment. The main job of progressives is to exert more influence, not so much on the President directly, as on the forces which condition his behavior. To elect him is not to have won their battle. They must also elect Representatives and Senators on whom they can depend. Education, the press, business and all the manifold aspects of public life must come within the scope of their attention. This is a long job, and they may find that they cannot make much more headway until the country plunges into another depression—as it surely will if a new "return to normalcy" succeeds the war, whether under Mr. Roosevelt's opponents or under a fourth term itself.

The mistake has been to rely too much on the Great Leader, counting on him to do everything, whereas he can do little unless the drift of social forces carries him along. This dependence on authority is the exact complement of the irrational hatred of "that man in the White House." There are signs that the prevailing atmosphere has infected the leader himself, who is reported to be reluctant to hear candid criticism, and somehow always stands in the way of anyone in his group who might attain independent enough eminence to become his successor. The progressive movement is weak indeed if there is only one man in the country who can carry its banner. Worse things might happen to it in the long run than defeat of a fourth-term candidate, if that were necessary to stimulate it to a more realistic organization of its own forces, and a policy more fundamental than to continue to place a single champion in the Presidential chair.

GEORGE SOULE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Houses of Earth

We live in a rammed-earth house. This house was built, so to speak, by standing the cellar up on edge and putting a roof on it. Even in the hottest summer days, the eighteen-inch walls of the house remain cool on the inside. These same thick walls repel the cold of winter and are about as fireproof as a granite rock.

Rammed-earth houses have big-time implications for two reasons just now. They can furnish excellent living quarters with a minimum of fabricated, shipped-in materials in this congested war world. Large rammed-earth housing projects could absorb millions of man hours very quickly and with hardly any "tooling up," when made work is urgently needed after the armistice. Perhaps the most important single advantage of rammed earth is the cost of materials. These same advantages make the method of value to the individual householder. One buys them by the acre, not by the sack or truck-load. The outside of my walls is not covered with stucco or weatherboarding: good Maryland clay-loam faces the world bare. The naturally varied pastel reds and yellows of this good earth give an effect which many people of artistic perceptions have voted excellent. Within, this same material makes a wall surface which one lives with easily. So lathe and plaster within, and clapboarding or stucco on the outside, are no expense at all. One gets a surface of considerable architectural merit as a bonus at no extra cost. If I wanted to paint or whitewash or stucco the walls, I could. But why gild the lily?

How do I know that my house of earth won't fall around my ears the next time it rains? It hasn't yet and there have been many good downpours since 1928 when we moved in. In fact, the first night we lived in it the lashing tail-end of the hurricane which did such damage in Miami that year swept up the coast and we had eight inches of rain driven by a near gale. I didn't sleep much that night, but the earth walls stood. They have stood ever since.

Rammed-earth construction is not new. Up and down the South and Central Atlantic States are a number of substantial houses built between 1750 and 1800. They have survived wars, fires and even modest earthquakes. A rammed-earth church at Charleston, South Carolina, with forty-foot walls has gone through two without suffering any damage. In France houses nine centuries old are still being lived in.

My own experience with the method has been limited to this one baptism of tamping. I wanted a house in the country, and a house that would not burn with frame-house enthusiasm at the drop of a match. I had very little money, but vast resources of ignorance and, it turned out, some persistence. So I began to live and think rammed earth and I learned a lot; my house of earth is the result.

It turned out quite early in the game that luck was going to be an important element. My living and learning brought to light one set of facts very quickly. The building industry and the home-financing industry would have nought of rammed earth. If I were ever to have a house of earth I would have to build it myself and finance it without benefit of building-and-loan. The mortgage-lend boys would eagerly accept twenty-five-dollar deposits to come out and "investigate," but by the second try I was convinced that I was going to need an architectural change of venue, to keep from going rapidly broke to no purpose at all. It was quite clear that rammed-earth construction was not being considered on any merits it might have. The hopefully labeled "appraisal" committees looked on the proceedings as the best of good clean fun, and fun not calculated to build up the morale of one bent on putting to work a "crazy idea" for building a house.

Building a rammed-earth house requires no elaborate machinery. The earth is rammed into a box which has neither top nor bottom, and usually only one end. Two boxes are joined together to make a continuous corner, and these boxes are all that one needs to build a house. The walls are solid earth—no framework of any kind. The sides of the box are bolted onto the foundation which is to carry the wall. Just at the start, the box does have two ends. The earth to be rammed into a wall is thrown into the box—about six inches of it. The earth is moist, but not wet—just good plowing earth. It is then tamped down with iron tampers, beginning with tampers with a small face, so the unrammed earth won't "bridge over" in patches. The final ramming is done with a large and heavy "finishing tamper" to consolidate everything.

When this first course of earth is tamped enough, another layer is thrown in and the process repeated. This goes on until the box is full of solidly tamped earth. The newly finished wall is quite strong and solid, able to support another course on top. Then the bolts holding the box onto the foundation below are released, and the box is moved along to the adjoining piece of foundation. One end of the box is now clamped onto the wall just finished, the other end is kept closed with an end board.

The bolts which clamp the bottom of the box onto the wall are under three feet of wall when the box is filled. They are worked out easily by twisting and pulling, leaving bolt holes through the wall which help to dry it uniformly. After the wall is dry, the bolt holes are filled with a clay-and-cement plaster, called "dagga" plaster.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And so the box is filled step by step, and refilled. Where there is to be a door or a window, "door blocks" or "window blocks" are placed in the box so that the space is not filled with earth. Timbers are used for lintels over doors and windows. It is necessary to have an exact plan of where all openings are to be before work begins.

After the first course of wall is finished, the box is bolted to the top of this course and the process repeated until the wall is high enough. A simple derrick helps enormously to move the box and to hoist up the earth. Mine was actuated by a home-made windlass attached to the rear wheel of an ancient Dodge automobile.

Of course it is essential that the right kind of earth be used. Too much clay cracks when it shrinks, and too much sand does not hold together. A surprising amount of sand works very well—something over half sand is quite satisfactory. It is necessary to get expert advice or to make test blocks and leave them exposed to the weather to find out whether a particular earth will make a wall which will stand. There is considerable latitude of opinion among the experts about what kinds of earth can or cannot be used. This suggests that a good many loamy soils are excellently adapted for this purpose and the widespread use of earth buildings of one kind or another supports this view.

So the house began to grow on the concrete foundation which week-end work and night and morning work had erected during the preceding two years. The walls began to rise in August, which was disconcerting to say the least. For the best expert opinion was that one had to stop work in July so that the walls could dry before freezing weather came round. From my experiments with rammed earth, conducted two years before seriously beginning work, I was convinced that this was a mistake. I gambled on that conviction against the experts and fortunately won. As a matter of fact, I was still ramming earth when the ground was white with frost every morning. And nothing happened.

By Thanksgiving the roof was on and the floors were in place. The house of earth was ready to face its first winter.

As can be imagined, my building operations throw an uncertain light on the relative cost of rammed earth as against other building media. They are valuable only in cases where the hopeful householder undertakes to be his own architect, contractor, foreman and chief carpenter, using unskilled labor for the actual ramming, moving forms, etc. Studies made by the United States Department of Agriculture and by several of the state universities vary a good deal in the estimate of savings. Rammed-earth walls have been said to cost only one-third as much as any other fireproof construction and perhaps two-thirds as much as wooden walls when lath, plastering and sheathing are all considered. Of course, the saving is all in the walls themselves, as the roof and floor construction is the same as in any other building. There is a continuing saving in fire-insurance cost, as a stone-house rate has been obtained.

This story may have a wider moral in the exciting days ahead. If the time ever comes when the American people at last make up their minds to cut through some of the vested interests and accumulated nonsense surrounding housing and really have low-cost houses, then rammed earth is going to be an important element. It will almost certainly have a place in such a program, but it is not much use to the lone house-hunter today. True, anyone with a strong back and not too weak a mind can get himself a roof over his head with less ready cash than any other way. But it is discouragingly clear from the hundreds of people who have talked to me about rammed-earth construction that this is not going to do many people very much good. By training, tradition and circumstances, most people are very rigidly chained to the present conventions regarding house construction. And through the "thumbs down" of the building trade and the house-financing trade, and through the veto of no building permit, the lone earth-rammer under most circumstances is licked before he starts.

But in spite of this, rammed earth is definitely on the make and it will be heard of more in the years ahead. Within the past decade a number of the state experiment stations have carried on elaborate tests of rammed-earth methods. Gadgets for making blocks of earth and building these into houses have been developed. Methods of testing the soil as to its suitability have been worked out. In recent months two federal agencies have taken up the cause of rammed earth. These are the Bureau of Standards and the United States Indian Service. The Bureau of Standards has coöperated in tests of various methods of constructing rammed-earth walls worked out by the Indian Service experts. These have demonstrated beyond doubt that this material is amply tough and that it has a definite place in building homes and farm outbuildings.

There are a number of technical bulletins on this subject. Bulletin 1500 of the Bureau of Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture contains all the essential facts about soils and methods and costs. Another bulletin by experts in the United States Indian Service brings up to date recent researches. The Bureau of Standards has also made extensive studies recently. These are now available. Consumers' Research has issued a report, listing recent publications.

The most hopeful recent developments have had to do with the production of "stabilized rammed earth," which can even be made from soils high in colloids—finely divided material in clay which swells disconcertingly when it becomes moist. This difficulty can be surmounted by the use of small quantities of emulsified asphalt or of Portland cement. These are added to the extent of about five percent of the soil to be used in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the outer surface of the walls. The main bulk of the wall still is derived from blended soil from the cellar. These "stabilized" walls are much more resistant to erosion than ordinary plain rammed earth, which, after a century or so, would weather through, as adobe houses eventually do. It appears that by the use of stabilized soil, rammed-earth buildings can be constructed practically anywhere in the United States.

So successful have the Indian Service experts been with this method that it has been formally adopted by the Indian Service as the type of building to be used on many of the reservations. The experience gained in building these structures will be available in the months to come, should large-scale utilization of rammed earth in other ways become important.

It would seem that in two ways rammed-earth construction might fit into large-scale building operations. One is in emergency construction during the present crisis. It is possible by this method to build livable and comfortable homes with much less transported material than by ordinary means. Roofing must be had and floor joints and rafters. But a minimum of lumber and a minimum of cement and stones or other heavy material are required. On farms and in suburban areas, homes and agricultural buildings could readily be constructed during odd times. It is not necessary to build a rammed-earth house all at once. It can be done as opportunity offers. This might be quite important in certain regions. The simplest way to build such walls is by hand ramming. The ramming can be done with air compressors and "jackhammers," but in a time when machinery and materials are needed elsewhere the development of a large-scale rammed-earth project might not be feasible.

If by an unlikely miracle, the American people should undertake to use rammed earth where it fits into the emergency picture, they could gain experience now which would be invaluable in the years of readjustment after the war. In a large housing project based on the best scientific knowledge of rammed-earth construction, located where the material was most suitable and arranged to utilize to the full the unique possibilities of the method, a rammed-earth housing project could absorb a very large number of man-hours and turn them into urgently needed living quarters for the American people. Here is a reservoir of "made work" which could be valuable in bridging employment gaps during periods of transition when jobs are scarce and made work is likely to be wasteful and superficial. But as yet the prejudices of people who "can't imagine anything so silly" have been an adequate barrier. After that, these are the three primary bunkers in rammed-earth utilization: labor-indifference, mortgage boycott and building-permit veto. Beyond these obstacles lies the possibility of keying rammed earth into a well rounded plan to give all Americans decent and adequate houses. It unquestionably has a place in that plan.

ROBERT C. COOK

For a Federated Europe

THERE IS NO NORMALCY to which Europe can return, unless you consider frustration, hatred and war as the norm. Europe was sick in 1914, worse in 1919, and moribund in 1939, and her disease was Nationalism. By Nationalism, men like Mazzini and Michelet meant brotherhood, both within the nation and among the nations: and this is the Nationalism that we want, not to destroy, but to release. But in our world, Nationalism has come to mean the totalitarian ideal, hundred-percentism, the belief that in a given territory, every one should feel, think and speak alike. Now Europe cannot be divided into such self-contained "nations" and live. In 1938, every frontier in Eastern and Central Europe was an infected wound; every conceivable frontier of the same kind tomorrow will be worse. Neither science nor the people's will can make the fallacy of totalitarian or absolute nationalism a verity. If we refuse to be blinded by the passionate prejudices which are among the chief causes of war, we shall see that in Europe the boundaries of tradition, economic activity, breed, language, religion, ideology, absolutely refuse to coincide. Europe must be one, because it cannot be intelligently divided.

The Europe wracked by Nationalism lies in ruin; and it would be the acme of foolishness to rebuild the crazy edifice on the same lines, with minor improvements which might prove worse than previous evils. I do not believe in bombardment as a method of slum clearance; but once the slums are cleared, who in his senses would restore them as slums?

An old-fashioned peace, a peace among governments, involves a vicious circle. You will first have to set up those governments again before they can sign a treaty; but by setting them up, you prejudge problems of regimes and boundaries which ought to be deferred. How do you know that Lichtenstein has a right to national existence? And do you expect Lichtenstein to be restored only to commit suicide? Created as the organs of purely national interests, these governments will intrigue and fight in order to defend the sacred egoism which is their sole *raison d'être*. And every one of them is bound to feel embittered and frustrated in the final settlement: the losers because they lose, the winners because they fail to gain enough. We shall again have a Hungary swearing: "No, no, never!" and an Italy wounded to the quick because she is not given

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough Yugoslavs to oppress. This way lies chaos and eternal war. The way out is forward.

Why not recognize the facts? The Nazi storm, which started as a nationalistic blast, has demonstrated the essential evil of national selfishness; and it has also, in its suicidal course, shattered all national barriers. We have now, in continental Europe, a *tabula rasa* such as never existed before. The Nazis have destroyed the physical power and the prestige of every nation, enemy or satellite. They have trampled upon every boundary. All governments are quislings or exiles. They, the Nazis, alone remain; and we have sworn that their power shall be utterly destroyed. Nothing remains but the people. All guardians have proved weak or wicked; democracy must be declared of age. Now is the time to give the people, not an array of fossil diplomats, but their first real chance in history. This can be achieved if we give up the idea of a formal conference and of a formal treaty between sovereign states. Let us envision Europe on the morrow of the armistice. It will everywhere be policed by provisional governments, all of them, willy nilly, under Allied supervision (and by Allied, I do not mean exclusively the Big Three). This Europe will have to face at once material tasks on a continental scale: repatriation, relief, restoration of communications. These will be entrusted to commissions which cannot be narrowly national. On that day therefore *Europe will exist*, more real than any of its artificial parts. When it comes to feeding the hungry, the first question will not be: "Is the man a Slovene, a Croatian or an Italian?" but: "Is he starving?"

As the next step, instead of calling a premature and chaotic peace conference, Europe should create a Constitutional Convention. This assembly could be elected on the basis of say one member for every million of population. The representatives would not be delegated by the states, but chosen directly by the people. Unlike the French Convention in 1792 and the French National Assembly in 1871, this body of men would not act as a government. Its sole task would be to discuss the organization of Europe as a whole. Current affairs would remain in the hands of the provisional governments, under interallied control.

What if Europe, or any part of Europe, should return delegates hostile to Union? We must be ready to face this possibility. If the delegates decide that the only proper method is to return to absolute nationalism, the convention will dissolve, and we shall have to make the best of the old ways. Alas! An abortive meeting would not be a new experience: witness the economic and disarmament conferences.

However, there is a general consensus that *some* form of international coöperation is desirable. A united Europe has always been a tradition of the European democrats: Aristide Briand was the heir of Victor Hugo and Lamartine. It has always been the conviction of the Socialists: their party, in any country, was but the local section of the workingmen's International. It has been for nineteen hundred years the ideal—and practice—of the Catholic Church; and the Nazis have managed to sell the notion—at an exorbitant price—to the conservatives who accepted their New Order.

It is a plain fact that there are many Pan-European problems for a Pan-European Assembly to discuss. What we may expect therefore is not a blank refusal to organize, but a tussle between the unitary or centralizing tendency, and the defence of local autonomies. This conflict exists in all federal states. It is an issue with us, as it is with Brazil and Argentina. I am inclined to think that the line of cleavage will not be regional, but economic and social; not between "Continentalists" and "Particularists," but between bourgeois and socialists. I am not attempting to prophesy what the European convention will decide; I am urging that the European convention be called.

Personally, I do not see why these two latent conflicts should take a tragic turn. Great powers of a general nature granted to the central government are not incompatible with extensive authority left to the local bodies. A large measure of continental socialism (every government is by definition socialistic, for it deals exclusively with the common interests), could leave free scope for a great deal of individual enterprise. Especially, cultural matters should be placed on a totally voluntary, non-territorial basis; so that a man who chooses to speak Polish could speak Polish anywhere without let or hindrance—provided he finds someone to understand him.

The European Commonwealth will start functioning at the earliest possible moment. Its Constitution will be frankly experimental, plastic, rudimentary, unencumbered by any philosophical Declaration of Rights. Principles—the protection of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—will be underlying rather than explicitly stated. The Union will have at once a great deal of work to do, which the local governments could not do so well. Gradually substituting its authority for that of the Inter-Allied Commissions, it will attend to reconstruction, relocation, expansion on a continental scale. Only when this primary work is well under way will the Union tackle the ticklish business of tracing provincial boundaries. Note that with the elimination of the independent national states, this problem will have lost much of its poisonous bitterness. If Europe forms a single *Zollverein*, if everyone is free to practise his own religion and speak his own language, if no one can be drafted into a nationalistic army, it matters very little whether a mining town in Upper Silesia be officially part of Poland or part of Prussia. The great unity would make it possible to create as many autonomous regions as may be desirable. A state like Yugoslavia was but a coalition born of fear. All disputed areas, such as Macedonia, the Sudeten, Transylvania,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be detached and made self-governing under federal supervision. Even Lichtenstein, Monaco and San Marino may survive, so long as they do not attempt to form an *autarchy*.

From the moral point of view, the effect of European Union would be magical. It alone permits us to abolish the distinction between the victors and the defeated, by abolishing both victors and defeated as military entities. Or rather, the "victors" everywhere will be the believers in democracy and friendly coöperation; the "defeated" everywhere will be those who put their trust in isolation, rivalry, domination. It will be the realization of Hitler's dream, an organized Europe, with every trace of Hitlerism removed, with Anti-Hitlerism triumphant. Remember that Europe is, and will be tomorrow, sick unto death. Creeping back into their little nationalistic holes would afford the people no spiritual relief, for all separate nations will remain *as nations* jealous, frustrated, resentful. On the contrary, give *the people* of Europe the new, the magnificent opportunity of building their continent together, of planning for ever closer, ever more fruitful association: and we may envisage a Renaissance spirit, a feeling of boundless promise and exultant energy.

Do not shackle Europe again with the petty, hate-filled Nationalism which found its logical culmination in Hitler! It is at ourselves that I am pointing a warning finger. Democratic Europe, with the least encouragement on our part, would be ready for Union. The chief obstacles are found in London and in Washington. These obstacles are the governments-in-exile, and the Machiavellians in our midst. A people's peace alone can save Europe: a diplomats' peace is being prepared. But it is for us, the people of America, to see to it that the people of Europe are not betrayed.

The chief opposition will come, not from inner forces in Europe, and not from Russia,[1] but from ourselves. A people's peace, paradoxically, is not "popular" with us. Frankly, the solution is crude—as crude as cutting the Gordian knot. It implies no erudition in diplomatic history, no clever deal, no *finesse à la Talleyrand*. John Doe could understand it, and the career men cannot. Unfortunately John Doe, humble fellow that he is, always afraid of "presuming," is overawed by the career men.

The democratic solution is not merely crude, it is revolutionary. A government of the people, by the people and for the people, superseding twenty governments of the State, by the State and for the State would, in many parts of Europe, and particularly in Germany, be a radical new departure. May the revolution be bloodless! But a revolution it will have to be, and we have among us Daughters of the Revolution who hate the very name. If we deal with the Italian republicans rather than with the House of Savoy, the disciples of Ferrero will wonder: "Where is *legitimacy* in all that?" Only it happens that we, the people, are the disciples of Jefferson, and not of Ferrero.

For those who under the name of realism are still hankering after power politics, a people's peace in Europe would be anathema. It would upset the neat system of the Big Four—which, in most world-wide issues, really becomes an Anglo-American condominium. It would create a new partner, Europe, not ready blindly to accept our *fiat*, a partner which might become as "difficult" as de Gaulle. Napoleon III was blamed for favoring Italian unity, and not taking the proper steps to prevent German unity. By the same token, European unity would not be in the interest of the United States.

There is worse to come: a genuinely democratic revolution in Europe will inevitably carry with it a heavy dose of socialism, far heavier than anything dreamt of by the most rabid of the New Dealers, and the readers of our conservative dailies are beginning to show signs of concern. Some of this socialism will be a legacy of Nazi-Fascism: for with all their faults, these regimes went farther in social reform than the innocuous Front Populaire. Most of it, however, will result from the excesses of Nazi-Fascism. The Nazis have scrambled property throughout Europe in a masterly fashion; the shortest cut to retribution and redistribution may be wholesale confiscation by and for the European Commonwealth.[1] Many capitalists collaborated heartily with the invader: the French are not likely to be very tender with the property rights of Renault. In most countries, the underground movement is led by the advanced elements, whose claims on the morrow of victory could not be flatly denied without causing a civil war. And the prestige of Russia stands high. It is fervently to be hoped that a United Europe, without joining the Soviet Union, will be on friendly terms with Russia; and that implies at least a "mixed" regime, in which socialism is not formally outlawed. Our hope is that there will be conservative statesmen wise enough to discover with Lord Tweedsmuir that a genuinely liberal democracy could at the same time be largely socialistic.

Toryism in all its forms, in continental Europe, in England, in America, will therefore be banded together against a people's peace, a peace not haggled over by diplomats, a peace created, endowed with life, apart from the traditional governments. No doubt Toryism is strong, even among New Dealers. This is no reason why we should adopt a defeatist attitude. Realism consists in gauging the difficulties, not in giving up any attempt to conquer them. This is a democratic country, and no set of diplomats can commit us for long to a policy which is the exact opposite of our professed principles. We want Europe to have the same

[1] Mr. Guérard's article was written before Russia's statement a few days ago opposing any East European federation headed by Poland, which the Russians believe would be aimed at themselves. – THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chance for Union that we have. And the simplest, most efficient way for Europe to unite is through the novel method of democracy.

Henri de Kérillis acutely said: "The triple-headed sphinx, Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, has not revealed his secret. Perhaps there are three secrets." Perhaps. Then it is all the more clearly our duty to ignore secret diplomacy altogether, and recognize none but "open covenants openly arrived at." We can still make ourselves heard. Let it be known that the American Union would look with favor upon the European Union. If we speak decisively enough, our great democratic leaders will be only too glad to guide us whither we want to go. Then the fossil diplomats may keep their Machiavellian secrets to the end of time.

ALBERT GUÉRARD

Georgia Justice and the FCC

ROCKING FURIOUSLY in a judge's chair in the federal court building on New York's Foley Square, Representative Gene Cox of Georgia handles the Federal Communications Commission as if it were a fugitive from a chain gang. The FCC's Chairman James Lawrence Fly, an ordinarily imperturbable Texan and a veteran of congressional investigations, mutters about "shell games" and writes a three-column protest to The New York Times. PM reprints, repeatedly, Check No. 178 on the City National Bank of Albany, Georgia, issued by Radio Station WALB to E. E. Cox. These, so far, are the main facts about the congressional investigation of the FCC going on in New York.

Papers which say the Cox Committee's technique copies the Dies technique do Gene Cox an injustice. Cox sponsored Dies and taught him tricks, or as he himself would put it, raised him from a pup. Cox with his henchmen on the Rules Committee—Smith of Virginia, Ham Fish of Dutchess County and the rest—have kept Dies going, as part of the general program to make the South vote Republican (see The New Republic supplement on the Seventy-eighth Congress for how well this program succeeded).

But now when Gene comes North to hold his own committee hearings, what happens? Dinner at the Plaza, lunch at the Biltmore, parades in Westchester, the way it was for Dies? Only a few stickfuls of type where Dies had columns, and no parades.

At the start, Cox's committee looked like a perfect set-up. It was directed to investigate the FCC, a natural target for two reasons—one, a former FCC employee had revealed Dies' popularity on the Axis radio; two, the agency turned up the embarrassing matter of the $2,500 check to Cox from the Georgia radio station. More, by investigating the FCC it would be possible to drag in another investigation of the OWI, an agency the Southern bloc itches to strangle as it strangled The Federal Theatre.

But something went wrong. Though he is legally acute enough to hold the House in the hollow of his hand, Cox isn't nearly as good a publicity man as Martin Dies. His committee counsel, Eugene L. Garey, found it necessary to write a memorandum about how to conduct hearings for maximum publicity value.

1. Decide what you want the newspapers to hit hardest and then shape each hearing so that the main point becomes the vortex of the testimony. Once that vortex is reached, adjourn.

2. In handling press releases, first put a release date on them . . . thus enabling reporters to study them and write better stories.

3. Limit the number of people authorized to speak for the committee. . . . It plugs leaks and helps preserve the concentration of purpose.

4. Do not permit distractions to occur, such as extraneous fusses with would-be witnesses, which might provide news that would bury the testimony which you want featured.

5. Do not space hearings more than twenty-four or forty-eight hours apart when on a controversial subject. This gives the opposition too much opportunity to make all kinds of counter-charges and replies by issuing statements to the newspapers.

6. Don't ever be afraid to recess a hearing even for five minutes, so that you keep the proceedings completely in control so far as creating news is concerned.

7. And this is most important: don't let the hearings or the evidence ever descend to the plane of a personal fight between the committee chairman and the head of the agency being investigated. The high plane of a duly-authorized Committee of the House of Representatives examining the operations of an agency of the executive branch for constructive purposes should be maintained at all costs.

Mr. Fly, with high ideals of what a congressional investigation should be, finds these rules shocking in themselves; and so they are. But actual conduct of the hearings suggests that they were made, though made in vain, to guide the committee chairman. A trip to the courthouse by this writer disclosed Mr. Cox, twenty-five minutes after the day's hearings were scheduled to begin, earnestly haranguing four bored newspaper reporters about the iniquities of the New Deal. "Twelve long years . . . socialistic reform . . . Russia . . . unions . . . American way of life . . . on last legs . . . next election."

That the investigation has been wholly one-sided is, perhaps, one reason why it has failed to attract public notice; so far there has been no real dramatic conflict. Often the hearings have proceeded lacking representa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tives of the FCC. Nor have there been "big names" among the witnesses. A Presidential order saved the time of War and Navy department people who had been summoned to testify; the committee got its first come-uppance when Chairman Fly was able to say he had a confidential document from the joint chiefs of staff refuting all complaints that the FCC had interfered with military intelligence.

This left the chief charge that the FCC had worked in cahoots with the OWI, said by Mr. Garey to have "played hell" with foreign-language stations. According to Elmer Davis, the OWI lacked both authority and funds to cope with German and Italian sympathizers chattering busily over the small stations; and the average citizen finds it difficult to understand why two government agencies should not have been allowed to coöperate on the problem. Chairman Fly explained that the FCC, in obtaining its appropriation from Congress, had made a full explanation of its investigations of foreign-language broadcasting, and been authorized to go ahead.

What Mr. Cox did not realize, in undertaking to prove that the FCC had exceeded its authority, was the testimony would never have the popular appeal of a Dies investigation. Here was no cops-and-robbers chase; instead of exposing Reds, it would be necessary to defend suspected persons accused of Fascist sympathies—which has only negative news value. From the Dies-Cox viewpoint these two accomplishments may seem equally worthy, but they are not equally popular. When the New York hearings turned up a series of German or Italian-born radio broadcasters who decided to become citizens in 1941, but lost their jobs anyhow, Mr. Cox stirred no excitement by talking of "unfair treatment" and "persecuting the poor devils." Not only is the public unused to seeing a Southern congressman essay, all unprepared, the role of defender of the persecuted; the public is uninterested in the hard luck of borderline cases of fascism.

For the committee, there has been real difficulty in deciding between Fascists and anti-Fascists, the Dies-Cox view being that anti-Fascists are Reds and even more dangerous than Axis supporters. Southerners tend to consider residence of several generations in this country prerequisite to really safe Americanism. On this basis it was easy to complain of newly arrived refugees hired by the OWI—that aliens should be on the government payroll was "shocking" to Gene Cox. Georgia has a state law to keep them out of jobs.

Between this attitude and other sections of Cox's procedure, there is a ludicrous discrepancy: Cox also accuses the FCC, through witnesses, of strangling private radio enterprises by forcing the firing of people accused of being Axis sympathizers "just because they had been in the country ten years without taking out papers." With a native distrust of anyone's ability to decide between friends and foes on the simple basis of conviction, the hundreds—indeed, thousands—of pages of the hearings became, as in the Dies hearings, a record of childish efforts to determine the trustworthiness of broadcasters by dates of ship arrival.

The Dies investigation had the same confusion but it dealt with bigger names and issues more easily simplified for public consumption. This perhaps is why the anti-administration press as a whole has been unable to help Mr. Cox as effectively as it helped Martin Dies. The attempts have been relatively feeble. President Noyes of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association saw in the FCC procedure the usual threat to "freedom of speech." Editor and Publisher attacked control of radio speakers by "appointed minor officials," while a World-Telegram editorial said "If broadcast statements are treasonable the law provides measures for dealing with them." The editorial neglected to explain that Congress had given the OWI no funds for monitoring to prevent or record treason; Editor and Publisher failed to consider that the alternative to control of radio speakers by "appointed minor officials," at least to the extent of discouraging signals to submarines, would be a blanket shut-down of stations.

But the object of the investigation was of course to afford occasion for criticizing Democrats, and perhaps The Washington Post hit hardest when it said that Cox's chairmanship of the committee, with the matter of the $2,500 check pending in the Justice Department, reflected on Speaker Rayburn. Rayburn's support of Cox did indeed smoke him out as an adherent of the Southern bloc rather than of the Administration. Actually Rayburn and Cox are old fishing companions at Higgins' Pond. While Cox wanted Garner or Hull for President, he might now be willing to settle for Rayburn for Vice President, to get rid of Wallace.

There is, of course, the point raised by Chairman Fly in his letter to The Times: "The congressional power of investigation is too essential an instrument for maintaining the health of our body politic to permit it to be prostituted for personal vengeance." Mr. Fly was chief counsel for the TVA during the investigation of that agency in 1938—an investigation which seemed at the time to be a waste of taxpayers' money, but which in contrast with subsequent investigations of the Dies-Cox type now seems a model of its kind. The TVA investigation, besides showing how an important and complex government agency worked, also shed light on the whole utilities business and especially on the doings of Mr. Wendell Willkie's Commonwealth and Southern. It is possible to imagine an equally useful investigation of the radio field which would tell the public something of the policies of major networks now supplying the news, and uncover something of the monopolized mysteries of television. But even a freshman in Congress would know enough not to entrust a fact-finding investigation to Gene Cox. WILLSON WHITMAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The Mystery of Quebec

IT IS SMALL WONDER that critics of President Roosevelt, who never have trusted him, are today increasingly irritated by his secretiveness and his unwillingness to take the American people into his confidence. Since the beginning of the war the President has concentrated upon grand military strategy to the neglect of almost everything else. More and more he has refused to answer questions at his press conferences. He has made fewer and fewer addresses to the nation. It has become more and more difficult for members of Congress to see him. He has failed even to keep many important officials of the government informed on matters of high policy. The President is almost like the man who refuses to talk to his wife, knowing that the less he says the fewer arguments he will start.

In his Ottawa speech the President said that "great councils" were held "on the free and honored soil of Canada" looking "to the future conduct of this war and to the years of building a new progress for mankind." He said it was "no secret" that "at Quebec there was much talk of the post-war world." But the President gave no inkling of what decisions had been reached, either in the military or the political sphere.

Before he went to Quebec the President told a group of his advisers what his plans were for the post-war world. But nothing was said to the American people, who have veto power over all decisions the President might make. Now come reports from high sources that at the Quebec conference the President and the Prime Minister, together with Secretary of State Hull and Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, agreed upon a course which will result in a virtual alliance to bind the United States and Great Britain after the termination of hostilities. If that is true, the American people have not been well prepared for such a decision.

"This war has not been sold to the American people—believe it or not," Palmer Hoyt, director of the domestic branch of the Office of War Information, said here a few days ago. If it has not been sold to them, it is largely because the White House has failed to provide the necessary leadership and the essential information. It is significant, I believe, that most of the information about the military conduct of the war has come from Mr. Churchill, not from President Roosevelt.

It was said for a long time that Mr. Roosevelt had let Vice President Wallace and Under Secretary of State Welles do the spade work in preparing the country for what he has in mind as America's role in the peace. But now those officials are no longer in the high councils of the administration. Yet it is they, with Mr. Churchill and Wendell L. Willkie, who have made the most significant contributions to an understanding of the meaning of the war and of the peace that must follow.

The President's close advisers usually admit that he has made only a small attempt to provide the intellectual leadership which the country needs. But they insist that from the point of view of the politician the President has adopted the wisest possible course. They say that the only aim the majority of the people have in fighting the war is to beat the Axis, and that the nation is not moved by any great ideal. They say, further, that the country is not really interested in foreign policy. They cite the case of France as an example. Except in New York and Washington, they say, few persons cared whether we did business with Giraud or de Gaulle. With perhaps one or two exceptions no comment about American policy with relation to France has come from a member of Congress.

So if you must criticize, these White House apologists say, criticize the American people for their lack of interest in the larger meaning of the war. We are fighting because of Pearl Harbor, not to liberate the world from Axis tyranny.

If all this is true, and certainly there is a large body of opinion to support the theory, it still hardly excuses the President for not attempting to provide the leadership and the intellectual stimulus, for not attempting to make clearer with frequent reports to the people the meaning of the war, and with not furnishing the leadership in the international field that will win friends abroad for American policy.

When the Quebec conference was announced it was immediately said by most observers that the question of getting Italy out of the war and the problem of improving our relations with Russia would be foremost on the agenda. But the joint statement by the President and the Prime Minister made no mention of Italy and it threw only indirect light on the disturbing question of our relations with Moscow. In the field of propaganda and political warfare the conference was a total failure if one is to judge by the formal statement and the President's Ottawa speech. Mr. Roosevelt did tell the Nazis that surrender would pay better now than later. But he almost ran away from even that simple statement, instead of trying to drive it home. Perhaps the President is right that we have to win this war on the field of battle, but would it hurt to try political warfare? This is a war of ideas as well as a war between armies.

From the day the conference began until it ended the Russian question stayed on the front pages. Secretary Hull denounced writers for printing incorrect information, but neither he nor anyone else threw any light on the question that disturbs the people most. The Quebec conference made no promise of a second front. It answered none of the questions about our talks with Moscow on Italy and Germany. Nothing was said about extending all possible aid to the gallant Red Army. At the conclusion of the Casablanca conference in January, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill announced that Premier Stalin had not been able to attend because of the "great offensive which he himself is directing." They explained that "both he and the Generalissimo (of China) were kept informed of developments."

Four and a half months later, after the conference in May at the White House, Mr. Churchill expressed the regrets of the Anglo-American leaders that Mr. Stalin had not attended and promised that every effort would be made to take the weight off the Russians and the Chinese. The expressions of cordiality and friendship following those meetings stand in sharp contrast to the uninspired Quebec announcement, coming as it did after the withdrawal of Ambassador Litvinov from Washington and the resignation of Mr. Welles from the State Department.

Washington T. R. B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not So Sound as Furious

IN ITS ANIMATED FORM, Major Alexander de Seversky's argument, called "Victory Through Air Power," is the least imaginative cartoon Disney has made, as well as the most naïve and brutal view of the war anyone has taken. The film's procedure is to show a sketchy, half-whimsical airplane history, emphasizing the advance we have made in two world wars in the science of demolition by airplane, after which de Seversky comes on in person (businesslike, with a good movie manner, in a streamlined office that would give any good architect nightmares) to present an illustrated lecture of his idea. The final impression is of a conglomeration of animated cartoon styles, mostly bad, which take so delighted an interest in the destructive possibilities of the airplane that they seem like the dreams of Buck Rogers' creator.

There is a disparity between the cartoon's aim, which is to sell to anyone yet unsold the idea of a great big air force, and the real effects of the salesmanship. Though the film raises certain critical objections to de Seversky's plan—as, why is it too costly to bomb Japan from the Pacific Islands, China, Russia, aircraft-carriers? (and answers them before most screen audiences will digest the answers)—it obviously doesn't raise enough such questions to give the Major a good run for his money. Audiences can wonder how long it will take to build so many Armadas of ocean-jumping Leviathans, what is to stop the Axis from building them or from inventing just as elaborate anti-aircraft devices, whether it is possible to demoralize a large city completely by air power, whether long-range bombers can defeat short-range fighters —and they will go on wondering for all the film cares. Because the film has the appearance of an educational project, it is obligated to care. In not doing so the pleasant feeling of learning something that the picture gives you is displaced by the unpleasant one of feeling propagandized. You find it is a hurdle race with only one man running, and hardly any hurdles on the track. Because all the forces operating in the war, enemy planes and operations, for instance, remain in the movie frozen at their present state, the Major's phantom airforce of the future shows to marvelous advantage—which is like someone in 1923 saying that the V8 of 1943 will beat the Model T.

Both Disney and de Seversky were carried away with the damage the airplane (of the future) could wreak. When de Seversky's dream comes true at the end of this movie, his airforce of super-bombers bristling with cannon, carrying monster loads of local-earthquake bombs, and armor-piercing rocket bombs with auxiliary charges, rend the screen with super-destruction. It is a carnival of destruction, relieved of all such imponderables as human beings, ideals and causes and effects. On de Seversky's part the overindulgence in knocking everything to pieces is merely that of a man who has an idea and wants to show it persuasively, and it is an idea he thinks will win the war. On Disney's part it arose when he undertook to illustrate the idea realistically: to equal the intensity of real life destruction his cartoonists exaggerated their explosions to a degree more appalling than any news reel. There is no reason anyone should leave this film feeling his life in any way safe from airplanes. The picture drives home the fact that, just as the automobile replaced the horse, the airplane will replace the human being.

It is true that the animated cartoon is the only medium that could pictorialize "Victory Through Air Power's" argument, which is largely still argued on the drafting board, but it is anything but malleable subject matter for Disney's art. His contribution to de Seversky's argument doesn't make good movie nor does it come close enough to grappling with any of its ideas to be called serious.

There is an interesting job around now called "The Fallen Sparrow," which has some good acting and is not disconcerted by its jimcrack plot. The plot's motivations and conflicts are unbelievable, and the characters are unclassified bodies on which have been hung such exotic matter as tics, twisted legs or names like "Pagan" and "sadist," but the director, Richard Wallace, has taken that for granted and by doing a good job with close-ups and acting has knit the thing tightly and excitingly together. It shows, in its love affair and in the playing of its star, John Garfield, plenty of resemblance to "The Maltese Falcon." It lacks, however, the striking detail and vivid contrast in people that the "Falcon" had, and Garfield proves that Bogart's grimace in which the lips are pulled back from the teeth doesn't mellow with use. The movie has vitality and there is a fine supporting contribution by John Miljan as a very average dour detective. In the movies, one element, in this case acting, can make a picture worth your time, which may only mean that the movies are in such a state they are easily redeemed.

MANNY FARBER

A Communication

Experience and Intelligence

SIR: The reflections of Messrs. Cowley and Rosenfeld (The New Republic, July 12 and 19) on the symposium, "The Failure of Nerve" (Partisan Review, No. 1-3, 1943) do not distinguish clearly enough between what the symposiasts set out to do and how well they succeeded in doing it. The symposium was primarily a reply to the arguments of modern-day obscurantism, an extended rejoinder to criticisms of humanistic and scientific naturalism. It was not a causal analysis of the resurgence of obscurantism. The justification of meeting arguments with arguments is that this is the only way to meet them, and that there are still some intellectuals who are sensitive to evidence and analysis.

The ever growing confusion between the grounds of belief and the causes of belief is another sign of the wave of irrationalism which has engulfed so much of the intellectual life of our time. Unless this distinction is strictly observed, there is no point whatsoever in any kind of argument, philosophical or political. Knowledge of what causes a man to believe what he does may make us suspicious of the reasons he advances for his belief, but it supplies no answer to the question of the validity of the reasons.

This does not mean that history has been made by argument or that intelligence is a power separated from emo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion and interest. It means that, to the extent it is in our power to make history, we should make it intelligently, with informed passion. Intelligence or wisdom is knowledge of the roots, the career and the consequences of human values. Sometimes a tea party is intelligent: sometimes a war or revolution; sometimes, in the context of discussion, an argument.

The very first article in the symposium, which happens to be mine, carefully distinguishes between the causes of "the new failure of nerve" and its grounds, and warns the reader that an answer to one is not an answer to the other:

> The causes of the failure of nerve in our time are multiple and obvious. Economic crises, world war, a bad peace, tragically inept statesmanship, the tidal waves of totalitarianism, tell the story of the twentieth century. These are the phenomena that are behind the interrupted careers, the frustrated hopes, the anxiety, the sense of being lost and alone, the growing bewilderment, fear and horror—that feed the theology of despair and the politics of wish. It is important to remember this. The "arguments" of those who have been panicked into embracing the new varieties of transcendental consolation may be met a thousand times over. But not until a democratic, freedom-and-welfare-planning economy is built out of what is left of our world, in which stable traditions can absorb the conventions of revolt of political man and the experiments of growth of individual men, will these intellectual excesses subside from epidemic to episodic proportions. Until then it is necessary to prevent intellectual hysteria from infecting those who still cling to the principles of rational experiment and analysis.

The first of Mr. Cowley's comments is that not sufficient emphasis was given to this point. But should not the adequacy of the emphasis be judged by *my* intent, *viz.*, to expose the bad reasoning and baseless assumptions of the current attacks on humanistic naturalism?

Mr. Cowley's second contention is that if I had asked why the Western World failed to adopt humanistic naturalism, the answer would reveal its invalidity as a philosophy. Here, too, I fear that Mr. Cowley has failed to distinguish between cause and ground. Have the causes which explain why the philosophy of evolution is rejected in Tennessee anything to do with the validity of the evidence for it? To be sure, an adequate philosophical theory will take note of the social facts which make its acceptance difficult. But it is not false merely because it is rejected, nor true because it is accepted. The proper corollary to be drawn is the necessity for an intelligent social program which will remove the obstacles to the freest use of intelligence.

If Mr. Cowley does less than justice to the intent of the symposium, Mr. Rosenfeld completely travesties its content. He assails something which he calls the "official" position of empiricism. There is no such thing. It is not our own; nor, as far as I know, anybody else's. He has made it all up out of his own head. To charge that we eradicate, deny or ignore "the richness, variety, pleasure, tragedy and sheer possibility of experience" is comparable to saying that to reject what a poet tells us about his poetry is to deny the existence of the poetry, that to correct a physician's diagnosis of his patient is to call the latter's existence into question. Mr. Rosenfeld does not support this preposterous imputation with a single citation. We were not concerned with experiences *per se* but with the *doctrinal* justifications and *institutional* expressions of some of these experiences. One of our criticisms of the latter is that they restrict the range of experience; another is that they deny the relevance of intelligence in evaluating experience. Every reader of Professor Dewey's work is aware that he starts and ends with experience, taking as his problem how to make experience richer, more intelligent and more secure. He does not exalt one experience over another but seeks to discover the conditions under which it can achieve its wisest and widest fulfilment.

Of course, "men live primarily by their mistakes," but does Mr. Rosenfeld want men to rest in them? Experience does not tell us when we make a mistake: only intelligence does. The work of intelligence presupposes the prior existence of experience—error, uncertainty, mistakes and all the anguish and yearnings Mr. Rosenfeld catalogues—not as illusions but as traits of an objective situation. The one thing Dewey has in common with Kierkegaard and Heidegger is the recognition that wherever he is, man is born to trouble, need, care. Thinking is an experience which mediates between other experiences, adding those qualities in the absence of which experiences remain blind and sometimes become fanatical. The world is not shorn of any of its extravagance by our analysis, but it is properly identified, partly for the joy of understanding it, and partly for purposes of intelligent action and control. There is always an experience behind an intellectual absurdity; but widely held absurdity makes easier moral atrocity.

Mr. Rosenfeld cannot have it both ways. In one sentence he grants the sole legitimacy of intelligence in evaluating all claims to knowledge. In another he tells us that "liberalism in thought," which prefaces intelligence in action, is not equipped to handle major catastrophes. What, then, does he offer in its stead? Yearning is a condition, not a solution, and many of the things yearned for either cannot be had or, like "God and immortality," are irrelevant in meeting the issues posed by catastrophe. When this is pointed out we are taxed with denying the fact that people yearn.

We all start with the simple acts and commitments of faith. But there are faiths and faiths. Mr. Rosenfeld assumes that they are all on the same level and that humanistic naturalism substitutes a diet of "canons and methods" for sustaining beliefs. He is doubly mistaken. Faiths are on the same level as facts of experience but not in their consequences and justifications. Some nourish and some do not. Some give life and some take it. Some brutalize and some civilize. Humanistic naturalism is not only a method but a self-critical faith in intelligence aware of its origins, fruits and function in experience. It does not stop with "canons and methods" but uses them to reach programs, doctrines, conclusions and new experiences.

New York City SIDNEY HOOK

FOR the most part I agree with Mr. Hook's answer to the first of my two comments. Our difference here is chiefly a matter of emphasis, as both of us pointed out. I feel, however, that it is a great deal more important to study the causes of what he calls "the new failure of nerve" than it is to argue logically against people who insist—as some of our new mystics do—that logic is worthless.

Mr. Hook misses the point of my second comment, probably because it was too briefly stated. The causes which explain why the philosophy of evolution is rejected in Ten-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nessee have absolutely nothing to do with the validity of the evidence for evolution; but they also have nothing to do with the questions I said that Mr. Hook might have asked. Those questions were, "Why hasn't any western country attempted to meet scientifically the challenge of poverty, unemployment and technological change? Why has Russia—which did make that attempt—produced something less than a Utopia after twenty years of devoted efforts? Why has Germany abandoned the scientific attitude for wholly illogical doctrines? And why have the democratic countries had so much difficulty in finding a positive faith of their own? These questions," I went on to say, "if approached without preconceptions, in a purely scientific spirit, might lead to answers not wholly in agreement with what Mr. Hook regards as the only scientific philosophy."

To put the matter as simply as possible, Mr. Hook's philosophy is, among other things, a theory of social change. In many instances it has been disregarded, in others it has been violently overturned, and in one case it has produced very different results from those that were expected. An examination of all these cases, in the scientific spirit, might show that something was missing or mistaken in the theory itself. Perhaps, as Mr. Rosenfeld suggests, it gives an altogether too simplified picture of human needs. – M. C.

IT IS one thing to meet arguments with arguments, but quite another to ignore the nature of one's opposition. Mr. Hook, I believe, makes this error. Although Mr. Hook mistakes him for a bad logician, the enemy is, fundamentally, a prophet. Modern-day obscurantism owes its appeal to a devotion to the problem of values. Its charges cannot be met through counterposing the problem of knowledge. To do so is to claim victory on another field, leaving the reactionary position unchallenged at the point of its greatest strength.

The brunt of my argument was simple. I meant to say that philosophy must recognize its obligations to the whole of experience, and not merely to those aspects which can best be dealt with through a set of perfected techniques. But naturalism must also represent a complete activity—more than analysis is involved. Since we accept naturalism in the light of implicit social values it is especially important that we restore urgency to values, giving them more than an intellectual certificate.

Of course reaction is based on a faith. But is that the source of its strength or its weakness? I see no reason why we cannot admit that as the source of its strength, so long as we attribute its weakness to falsehood. And at least we should have faith in our own truths.

Therefore if naturalism is to prevail we shall need in addition to methodology the full moral temperament which alone can provide the motive to the doctrine. And this motive is frankly an interested and emotional one. How else do the values arise which empiricism and scientific method are to implement? To speak otherwise is to leave moral initiative to the enemy. And then our values recede into the background as we forget the experience which made them urgent, and we simply accept what is handed down to us. Under such conditions, method, by whatever name, becomes a means for preserving the status quo—a legacy, an automatic moral transfer from other generations whose crises, ironically, were not so deep as own own. – I. R.

The Bandwagon

The decision of Congress not to permit the New Deal extremists to require grade-labeling of all commodities should be hailed by the public as a victory for free enterprise. . . . There was more than a strong suspicion . . . that if the scheme were permitted it would inevitably be abused for political purposes or to bring on the Communist state, or at least a degree of bureaucratic control of the lives of the people, with communism or state socialism as the next logical step. – *From The Los Angeles Times.*

The Swiss radio, heard here, quoted Stefani, official Italian news agency, as saying that demonstrations in Italy were "entirely misunderstood" abroad. "They are merely expressions of patriotic enthusiasm, loyalty to the House of Savoy and confidence in the new government," Stefani said. – *From The New York Times.*

BLAMES FLOOD ON NEW DEAL
– *Headline in The Indianapolis Times.*

That All-Out Effort

On every Monday afternoon at two o'clock, Christ Church, Alexandria, Va., is open for those who wish to pray for the United States. – *From Forward Today, a church publication.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; $1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Catholics and Politics

SIR: Lawrence Fernsworth, in your issue of July 5, reproves the Rev. John Haynes Holmes for writing, with respect to the late George P. West's article, "The Catholic Issue" (March 1), that "this is no time to stir up suspicion and hostility [against the Catholic Church], especially as the Catholic Church is in this present crisis uncompromisingly opposed to Nazism. . . . In this country the Catholics are as loyal as any group of citizens anywhere."

Mr. Fernsworth says that "Dr. Holmes's statement that the Pope and the Church have utterly repudiated Hitlerism . . . is hardly a critical one . . . The Vatican and the German prelates were still trying to make deals with Hitler long after the democracies were at war with him." But the democracies were not at war with him until September, 1939, and Pope Pius XI's bold attack on Nazism—the encyclical "Mit Brenender Sorge"—was published in March, 1937.

Mr. Fernsworth goes on to accuse Dr. Holmes of failing to distinguish between "clerical—and therefore [?] political—Catholicism" and "the spiritual Catholicism which is the heritage of the millions of good Catholics who do not take their politics from their clergy."

This *is* the time, Mr. Fernsworth implies, to stir up suspicion and hostility against "the Roman Catholic clergy and press." For they are guilty, he says, of "bold thrusts against the most cherished and fundamental principles of the American way . . . denials of the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sneers at American liberalism and . . . political maneuvers to enforce such views."

Since many of your subscribers are probably not readers of the Catholic press, and very likely have little or no access to the public or private pronouncements of the Catholic clergy, it might very well be that Mr. Fernsworth's charges will sow the seeds of "suspicion and hostility" in their minds. Therefore I hope you will permit me to point out, in the first place, that Mr. Fernsworth's dichotomy is the familiar stratagem used so successfully by Hitler in many areas, but quite unsuccessfully against the Catholic Church in Germany, *i. e.*, the device of "divide and conquer." All along, Hitler posed as the friend of the "good Catholics," the "spiritual Catholics." It was only the clergy that he opposed—first the "immoral clergy," next the "political clergy." And any Catholic priest or bishop who, on ethical grounds, opposed "the campaign of [the German] doctors and social workers" to enforce human sterilization as a cure of "poverty, disease and crime" (to quote from the article by the late George P. West which started this whole controversy), was a "political clergyman." So was any priest or bishop who expounded the traditional Catholic doctrine of the dignity of the human soul, and who taught that, as a consequence, the theory of the totalitarian state was contrary to Catholic teaching.

I hope you will permit me to point out, in the second place, that Mr. Fernsworth's very serious charges against "the Roman Catholic clergy and press" are nothing more than unsupported assertions. They are, in fact, unsupportable falsehoods. Except that if Mr. Fernsworth means, by "American liberalism," a purely Fernsworthian conception of liberalism, I trust that some of us Catholics may be allowed a slight sneer.

EDWARD J. HEFFRON, Executive Secretary,
Washington, D. C. National Council of Catholic Men

SIR: I have always understood that decorous and civilized discussion was governed by certain laws of decency. But since the executive secretary of the National Council of Catholic Men seems never to have heard of such laws he lacks the qualifications to certify him as an opponent of men who have regard for their dignity and honor.

This secretary of a Catholic association besmirches the honorable name of Catholic, first by bearing false witness and next by attempting to injure a neighbor, demonstrating thereby a sad lack of familiarity with two of the most elemental laws on which his religion is founded. The whole import of his letter is not fair discussion but the doing of harm. It is of a piece with the slander and pressure campaigns and the boycotts of which you and your readers have had cause to complain.

He opens his letter with a gratuitous untruth by quoting words from another man's letter which never appeared in my own and by affirming on the basis of this quotation, that "This *is* the time, Mr. Fernsworth implies, to stir up suspicion and hostility against 'the Roman Catholic clergy and press.'" What I did was to point out that opposition to the dangerous activities of a political clergy and press, of which you and your readers have so amply complained, had nothing in common with hostility to Catholics or to the Church operating within the sphere of religion; was not anti-Catholic, in short. And I asked: "How can the United States of America be divided by fighting for those principles by which . . . the country is united?"

There are no printable words in the several languages I know by which I can suitably qualify his attempts to place my measured defense of the good citizenship of Catholics on a level with what he calls "the familiar stratagem used so successfully by Hitler." I have no objections to this writer setting himself up as an authority on the stratagems of Hitler. Personally I have not studied them, since there are certain contaminations I fear. But the distinction I made between spiritual Catholics, and that important part of their hierarchy, clergy and press that operates in the political domain, was a commonplace in the most Catholic countries of Europe centuries before Hitler was heard of. And so, I greatly fear, they shall continue to be long after Hitler has vanished.

But as to touching my personal self, I feel no need of defense against the imputations of this kind of statement. While the authority and political power of the Church in this country, the majority of its prelates, its pulpits and its press, with all their capacity for doing great and irreparable harm, were marshaled to accomplish the destruction of popular government in Spain, to bend the policy of my country to their own designs with irreparable harm to my country, and to advance the cause of Nazi and Fascist while in Spain these elements fought to their victory the first battle of this second world war, I was sounding again and again my warnings of the danger to freedom—and to us—that the triumph of Nazism and fascism would mean. And for this, and for my obstinacy in presenting the facts in so far as it lay within my power to discover them, I was calumniated in public and private by clergy and press.

This systematic effort to injure went so far as to strike at my livelihood and at my reputation and honor, it struck even at those who are nearest and dearest to me.

I recite this to inform those who still may need such information that I need no defense against the . . . imputations of the Executive Secretary of the National Council of Catholic Men.

The writer then drags in a lot of stuff about the German clergy and their fight for the dignity of man. None of this comes within the purview of my letter. I did not and do not care to discuss the pros and cons of that now. But I mention the fact lest the unwary be led to suppose that the writer is refuting any statement for which I am responsible. When, on the basis of this kind of distortion, the writer imputes falsehood to me, he is guilty of the same kind of irregular conduct which I have signaled at the outset of this letter. As to the charge itself, coming in this manner from this source, I declare myself not to have heard it.

The writer calls loudly for proof—of what I can't exactly discover. But if he means proof of the political action of the hierarchy and clergy and their press—the proof lies all around him. He has only to turn to the files of that press—or for that matter to the reports of the secular press. It has been amply discussed in The New Republic itself. Their attitude in the Spanish affair, which I have cited, should be proof enough, if any were needed. They are at it up to this very moment. Week after week—as I can demonstrate by chapter and verse—they labor at casting suspicion on one of our allies, Russia, thus doing the work of the enemy and defying our President. They have denounced the bombing of Rome in terms incompatible with any notion I have of loyalty toward my country in wartime. I have seen many of these diatribes, but the most intolerable one, which I requote from Time magazine, appeared in The Evangelist of Albany, to wit: "The bombing . . . smells to Heaven as an act of vandalism." The same press has violently taken—and still takes—the side of the Polish Government in Exile in its disrupting conflict with Russia. And at this very moment another political campaign is afoot in that press for the destruction of liberalism in the future government of Italy—all of a piece with the campaign for the destruction of liberalism in Spain. With proofs such as these the cup overflows.

These procedures are veritably Satanic—to use a word favored in the encyclicals and other ecclesiastical literature—in their potency for destructiveness of the national unity. Yet we are told we must not raise a hand or whisper a word against

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them lest the national unity be endangered. What Phariseeism! What absurdity!

As to my statement that the Vatican and the German priests still try to make deals with Hitler, I think the cited encyclical, "Mit Brenender Sorge," is an excellent *pièce justificative* on that score. The same is true of that shameful document, the German Bishops' memorial of December 18, 1942. The burden of both is that Nazidom still declines to come to terms with the Church. The less said about them the better for our peace of mind.

May I not, in closing, cite the opening lines of a letter I have just received from an old Catholic friend in Oregon: "Just read an editorial in the July 18 Denver Register [Catholic weekly] about a letter you had in the July 5 New Republic. Congratulations. If only there were more men like you to speak up and tell the truth and not be ashamed of being a Catholic."

New York City LAWRENCE FERNSWORTH

The Voice of the Farmer

SIR: Your articles embellishing the labor leaders and their follies are becoming tiresome to the reader. Why not consider agriculture's viewpoint occasionally?

The labor class is crying about the "high cost of living" when as a matter of fact food prices have risen materially less than have wages. In a summary of economic conditions, the United States Department of Agriculture points out in the June, 1943, issue of The Agricultural Situation that "comparison of food prices with income for the average United States consumer show that a rise in consumer purchasing power has far outrun the advance in retail food prices. "Throughout the war period retail food prices have risen less rapidly than average consumer incomes. The average United States consumer today finds that he can purchase a 'food basket' of specified foods for a smaller share of his income than at any period of record." Statistics indicate that income of industrial workers has risen to 296 compared with 100 for the years 1935-1939, while cost of living is only 125 now compared with 100 for the years 1935-39. Yet labor leaders have served notice on the President of the United States that unless he moved at once to roll prices back, they would begin a campaign to break the Little Steel wage formula and to oust price administrator Prentiss M. Brown. Perhaps it is time for producers of food to demand consideration.

If the farmers are abused much more by "roll-backs" and price meddlers there may be a food famine comparable to the coal shortage. Already livestock production is dropping off as a result of too much economic boondoggling. When price fixers finally fail and the true law of supply and demand takes its effect, then will the consumer begin to learn what food scarcity really is.

Excelsior, Minn. H. H. ASPDEN

The Future of Europe

[The letter below is a reply to an inquiry made by The New Republic and addressed to a number of persons. We asked several questions, including what should be done with Germany after the war, who should conduct the reconstruction of Europe, what future can be seen for the French Colonial Empire and whether a federated Europe is now possible. – THE EDITORS]

SIR: In my opinion, Germany should be reëstablished upon a sound, democratic and constructive basis when the war is over. It would in my judgment be a mistake to break up Germany by dividing it into some sort of loose federation of states.

I heartily favor the punishment of those who are found guilty of inhuman acts during the war. A large number of those who were members of the Gestapo who committed horrible crimes in Germany should be executed.

I would deem it unwise and inadvisible to break up German industry and move her factory equipment into the occupied countries to take the place of factories destroyed or stolen by the Germans. We cannot and must not embark upon a program of persecution if we are to prevent future wars.

I do not feel that Germany should be required to rebuild Rotterdam or restore the hydro-electric dam at Dnieperstroy. These terrible, destructive acts were committed during the course of war. We must accept them as incidental and the consequences of war. The reconstruction of Europe after the war should be worked out by the Allies and in consultation with European people who are the victims of the war.

I do not believe that the United Nations should interfere in any way whatsoever with the reëducation and the subsequent continuing education of the German people. That is a problem which must be dealth with by the German people themselves.

I could not comment on where the new leaders for Germany are to be found except to say that I hope the liberal, progressive, forward-looking people in Germany will be called to serve Germany in the reconstruction of the German government.

I am of the opinion that some of the French colonies will be returned to the French Empire but some of them never will.

I do not believe that a federated Europe on the analogy of the United States is now possible.

WILLIAM GREEN, President,
Washington, D. C. American Federation of Labor

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Harold J. Ruttenberg, assistant director for manpower of the steel division of the WPB, who was borrowed for that purpose from his job as research director of the United Steelworkers of America (CIO) writes to comment on our editorial, "Labor and the Intellectuals," in the issue of August 9. Mr. Ruttenberg gives us the names of a long list of officials of the Steelworkers who are graduates of various colleges including Notre Dame, Cornell, Harvard, Yale, Washington and Jefferson, University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Tech, Ohio University and Swarthmore.

The Reverend Edward Morgan of Boston, Massachusetts, writes to protest this country's apparent policy of dealing with the king of Italy. "The people of Italy in the past made Italy great, respected and beloved, and are unquestionably able to do so again," the Rev. Mr. Morgan says, but they will not be able to do so and build a "first-class, coöperating democratic power" as long as we continue to address "a vacillating king, an archaic dynasty, a tottering throne, a tarnished crown, a broken scepter."

John Bright of New York City expresses appreciation for Enrique Prado's article on Sinarquism in the United States in our July 26 issue. Mr. Bright, however, rebuts the contention of Mr. Prado that Sinarquism is attractive to Mexicans in the United States "who not only are social outcasts in the country where they live, but also feel abandoned by the Mexican government."

Mr. Bright says that: "Despite its fine intentions, this statement adds up to an untruth and a libel of the Mexican-American residents of the U. S. Southwest. We have had considerable experience with these harassed people and can testify responsibly that, with a few exceptions, they feel in no sense 'abandoned by the Mexican government.' The consulate is their second church and their heroes remain steadfastly the protagonists of Mexico's democratic Revolution, Avila Camacho and Lazaro Cardenas. The fanatical efforts of the Sinarquistas to undermine this faith, although abetted by the majority of the Spanish-speaking priests (themselves renegades from the Revolution), have fallen on [barren] soil."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

The Forster Revival

IT WILL AMUSE the author of "My Own Centenary" to know that he has become the subject of a revival on this side of the Atlantic. I was under the impression, with the deaths of Joyce and Virginia Woolf that, for whatever little it was worth, E. M. Forster had been quietly recognized by literate Americans as the most important surviving English novelist. It appears, however, that the devoted readers of Daphne du Maurier and J. B. Priestley have continued to confuse him with E. M. Delafield, Norman Foerster and S. Foster Damon. We must therefore be grateful to the trumpetings of the reviewers of The New Yorker, Time, The Nation and The New York Times Book Review for calling to our attention Lionel Trilling's critical study of Forster[1] and the reprints of his four early novels.[2]

Mr. Trilling's book—one of the Makers of Modern Literature Series, so brilliantly inaugurated by Harry Levin's "James Joyce"—is an excellent introduction to Forster, if it completely disarms the reader by admitting nearly everything that can be said against Forster in the course of setting him down as "the only living novelist who can be read again and again and who, after each reading, gives me what few writers can give us after our first days of novel-reading, the sensation of having learned something." In place of the rambling appreciation of Rose Macaulay's "The Writings of E. M. Forster," an earlier book-length study of the writer, Mr. Trilling focuses upon Forster as a deliberate artist and conscious moralist. An introductory chapter—"Forster and the Liberal Imagination"—is a provocative study of a thinker who shares the doctrines of liberalism, but who is "at war with the liberal imagination." In subsequent chapters the significance of Forster's education and early travels is revealed and his short stories neatly brought together and explored for the themes that are to dominate his longer fiction. A chapter is devoted to each of the novels, and a final chapter surveys his literary criticism and doubling back on the introductory remarks emerges with a master.

Forster's shorter fiction and his critical and miscellaneous writings suffer heavily from outmoded fantasy, archness and an appalling lack of rigor for a serious writer. Faced with his undoubted peers—the great Russians, say—he is frequently very good indeed, but in commenting on his immediate superiors—James and Joyce, for example—he is often merely peevish. Mr. Trilling sees this, and it is vastly to his credit that he does not let his beloved author get away with his petty and slighting remarks on his betters. I wish that Mr. Trilling had been as severe with Forster's style, which has been overpraised too often. Magnificent as it is at times—he is one of the world's few epigrammatists who do not constantly annoy the reader, and there are descriptive passages in the English novels and in "A Passage to India" that have never been equaled by an English novelist—his prose is too often platitudinously allusive, the metaphors strained and literary, the manner as overblown as that of Lytton Strachey. Witness, for example, these not unrepresentative sentences from "Howards End":

> The letter that she wrote Mrs. Wilcox glowed with the native hue of resolution. The pale cast of thought was with her a breath rather than a tarnish, a breath that leaves the colors all the more vivid when it has been wiped away.

At least one of Mr. Trilling's crucial judgments I would question sharply: is, as he holds, "Howards End" Forster's masterpiece? I think not, although I am less certain after reading Mr. Trilling's cogent effort to endow it with a larger symbolic and social significance than anyone else has seen in it. From his analysis it emerges as one of the great fictional commentaries on the class struggle and a deeper and truer "Heartbreak House" of modern life. But I remain persuaded that "A Passage to India" is his best novel and "The Longest Journey"—his single ambitious failure—the book that Forsterians will most eagerly return to. For in them there are long moments in which Forster suspends his "refusal of greatness" and writes with the passionate understanding which for me at any rate is largely verbal in most of the rest of his work.

On the whole I think that Professor Trilling, along with the reviewers referred to earlier, has taken Forster too seriously. I say this with the instruction and delight that Forster so frequently offers fully in mind, but it must be said of the writer who justifies the claim of England's most important living novelist, or we put too high a value upon him and upon the modern English novel. As Harry Levin has reminded us, English fiction has been pretty thin fare for a long time, enriched most generously by the Pole, Conrad, the American, Henry James, and the Irish-European, James Joyce. Set beside them Galsworthy, Bennett, Wells, Virginia Woolf and more recently Aldous Huxley, Elizabeth Bowen, Graham Greene and Christopher Isherwood (I list only those writers I can read with pleasure) are much smaller figures.

The greater English novelists of the recent past are dead. Among the living are middle-aged writers like Huxley who have left unfulfilled the promise of their early work and younger writers like Isherwood and Henry Green who may in their own good time extend the great traditions of the English novel. And there is Forster, preëminent among the survivors. By all means let us cry up his virtues to the unbelieving, but let's not go around like Clifton Fadiman using him as a club with which to beat the bloody head of D. H. Lawrence.

GEORGE MAYBERRY

[1] E. M. Forster, by Lionel Trilling. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions. 192 pages. $1.50.

[2] Where Angels Fear to Tread, by E. M. Forster. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 283 pages. $2.50.
The Longest Journey, by E. M. Forster. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions. 327 pages. $1.
A Room With a View, by E. M. Forster. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions. 318 pages. $1.
Howards End, by E. M. Forster. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 393 pages. $2.50.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hectic Harlem

New World A-Coming, by Roi Ottley. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 347 pages. $3.

UNDER THE CAPTION, "Hectic Harlem," Roi Ottley conducted an entertaining and popular night-life column in one of New York's Negro newspapers during the melancholy years of the depression. Chronicler of trivialities, creator of fables, and popularizer of much of the vivid slang current in Harlem, he contributed a note of gaiety in an era of gloom, and became one of the most widely read columnists in the Negro press. In "New World A-Coming," his first book, Mr. Ottley broadens the scope of his observations, taking a more serious view of the problems confronting Negroes today. In the transition, however, he has retained much of the flavorsome racial idiom which gave zest and vitality to his column. Unfortunately, some of the weaknesses of night life reporting are also carried over. There is the same accent on the bizarre, the embellishment of prosaic fact, and disregard of statistics. While disconcerting to the informed reader, these failings do not materially distort the picture which the author presents.

Mr. Ottley depicts Harlem as the capital of the Negro world wherein representatives of the darker races from every corner of the globe are fusing a common front in their struggle for freedom in a world too long dominated by the imperialist elements of the white minority. From all sections of our country, from the West Indies, from Central and South America, from Africa and from the Orient, the colored peoples of the world have gathered in Harlem. "Here live hundreds of different peoples," Ottley reports, "subdivided into a bewildering array of clans, tribes, races, cultures and colors—of red, brown, yellow, white and black, and unimaginable shades between. . . . Today, in spite of the dissimilar elements in its populations, the community is well on its way to homogeneity." The realization of common interest has been heightened by the war. No wonder then, that in Harlem there is much keener understanding and deeper appreciation of India's struggle for independence than among the editorial writers and political commentators of the metropolitan press.

Among the more solid chapters is one aptly entitled "The Slum-Shocked," in which the story of the wild night of March 20, 1935, is recounted. That riot, like the more recent disturbance in Harlem, was deeply rooted in the social unrest prevailing then, as now, in that section of the city. The bitter and inevitable fruit of discrimination, poverty and frustration is violence. Police may suppress the mob, but cannot eradicate the cause. No lasting cure can be effected until the nation is purged of the virus of racial prejudice which imposes a status of second-class citizenship upon the Negro, forces him to live in run-down and overcrowded tenements and shacks, and denies him opportunities for economic security and cultural development. "Slum shock," Mr. Ottley asserts, "was brought on by years of living in such houses—plus chronic unemployment, dependency, discrimination, delinquency, disease and death."

The delicate question of anti-Semitism among Negroes is explored and evaluated. "Actually," the author reports, "the whole business of anti-Jewish sentiment among Negroes is largely an urban manifestation, and stems directly from the Negro's own depressed condition socially and economically, and is essentially an *anti-white* manifestation." The points of contact which Negroes have with whites are largely with fellow workers, landlords, merchants and employers. In a community like Harlem, these contacts are more commonly with Jews than with gentile whites. Understandably, no tenant loves his landlord—particularly the man who collects rent for a sub-standard dwelling. The fact is, as Mr. Ottley points out, many Jews have been in the forefront of the fight for Negro rights. Wealthy Jews have contributed to Negro philanthropies and working-class Jews have been instrumental in bringing Negroes into the labor movement.

In depicting the color and rhythm of Harlem, Roi Ottley is at his best. It is an area in which, as a native son, he is completely at home. He knows its dives and night clubs, as well as its business enterprises, its churches and uplift organizations. He knows the people, the leaders as well as the masses, their temper, their foibles, and the language they speak. He knows the problems which confront them, and the deep social unrest which these problems have created. Writing about this scene with zest, vitality and bright imagery, he faithfully reflects the mood of the people, voicing their militant demand for a full share of "democracy—cleansed and refreshed," and expressing their faith in the ultimate realization of this demand.

HENRY LEE MOON

We Vote as We Live

Ballots and the Democratic Class Struggle, by Dewey Anderson and Percy E. Davidson. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 390 pages. $4.

EVERYONE HAS HIS THEORIES about why people vote as they do; this book has the merit of being one of the few intensive statistical studies revealing most of the relevant facts concerning voting habits in a specific area. The unit chosen for study, Santa Clara County, California, may not be typical of the country as a whole, but the results are so nearly what one would expect for a traditionally Republican community that one is tempted to guess that it is typical at least for many others in the North. It is also possible to assume that the same conclusions might apply in the South if one reversed the party names.

While there is a variation in the votes cast for the two major parties from year to year, and a somewhat smaller variation in the registration figures, the essential characteristics of the pattern are not greatly changed. Without going into the refinements of the statistics, which deserve to be carefully studied by all who have an interest in the subject, it is possible to summarize roughly what they show. The people who have occupations with the higher prestige, those who have the higher incomes, and to a somewhat smaller degree, those who have the larger property stakes, are predominantly Republican. The percentage of Democratic votes increases steadily as one goes down the scale, no matter what test of economic or social gradation one applies. This is true even as one steps from skilled workers to semi-skilled and from them to the unskilled. These factors apparently play a far greater role in voting than race, nationality, religion or sex, although the authors do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find a tendency for women to conform more closely to the traditional pattern than men. It is also true, of course, that there is a correlation between the characteristics connected with birth or inheritance and the occupational or economic ones.

It is emphasized by the authors that this picture is a statistical one, revealing tendencies with many exceptions, rather than an absolute division along class lines. One cannot predict with certainty that because a given individual has high prestige in the community or a large income he will be a Republican. And there are interesting subdivisions within the main groups. While the professions, for instance, are as a whole more solidly Republican than any other occupation, those professional workers who are adherents of the leading party by 63 percent or more are librarians, school officials, attorneys, dentists, physicians, clergymen, teachers and engineers, while trained nurses and druggists are Republican by between 52 and 62 percent, and musicians and writers are Republican by only 51 percent or less. And at the other end of the scale, the only unskilled workers who belong to the high Republican group are houseworkers, while custodians, laundry workers, janitors, caretakers, railway section hands and gardeners belong to the moderate Republican group, and teamsters, cement workers, fruit workers, general laborers, cannery workers and waiters are least Republican of all.

It is striking that the only occupation which is not represented in the low-Republican group consists of proprietors, managers and officials.

The interpretation which the authors draw from these facts is not at all the rigid Marxist one that people are divided into classes according to their ownership of productive property. They see the stratification as a complex one stemming mainly from social tradition, with a large component of habit and another of prestige. They are far from hopeless of achieving political changes in the interest of the masses by the instrument of the ballot. They point out that this would follow not only from the education of the voters of the lower economic brackets in the action required to serve their interests, but also from better information on the part of voters at the upper end of the scale. Conflicts there undoubtedly are, but in many cases the interests of all might be served by better information and adjustment among the competing groups.

The authors do vigorously dispute, however, the further usefulness of inculcating the American mythology which would merge the interests of all citizens and groups in an undifferentiated search for the "common good," ignoring all classes and group differences simply because all individuals have theoretical political equality. Education, they believe, should be directed rather to careful definition of the separate interests, together with training in the means of their mutual accommodation under a democratic system.

There is undoubted truth in this position, but to the reviewer the authors seem to carry it too far. What they propose is capable, at its worst, of producing a log-rolled tariff, or of bringing about a competition between labor and agriculture for greater monetary rewards at a time when the interest of all demands a stable price level. Do we not need, instead of a deflation of the concept of the common interest, a better and more dynamic definition of it?

GEORGE SOULE

New Wine, Old Bottle

Origins of the American Revolution, by John C. Miller. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. An Atlantic Monthly Press Book. 519 pages. $3.50.

IN AN OLDISH MOVIE—"The Remarkable Andrew"—a reincarnated Old Hickory reads a "modern" life of himself and enjoys a great laugh. Can it be then, that history is but a joke—played upon our forebears by bookish progeny; or upon our scholars by the dead? Histories are of two kinds: one tries to interpret what our ancestors did; the other scorns interpretation, celebrating only the FACTS. What astonishment in ghostly conclaves the first must cause by its innocent conjectures; and the second by what its cherished FACTS imply! What double astonishment the present book must cause, which strives to produce History No. 1 with the technique of No. 2, which strives to give new meaning to the American Revolution by reciting the dreary old facts.

This "Origins of the American Revolution" might be a joke to our progenitors, but it will hardly make them laugh. For it is such an old joke—this tale of taxes, riots, congresses and kings. The publishers do Professor Miller a great injustice when they label this a "modern" history. It is no more modern than the GOP or "The Student Prince." A great deal of research here and abroad has contributed to the making of this book. But the research has only found in fresh quotations new flesh for a dinosaurian skeleton. Professor Miller writes as if the Revolution had its sources only in the British Parliament and the colonial assemblies.

TOMORROW

Special 2nd Anniversary Issue of "The Magazine of the Future"

WHY INTELLECTUALS ARE TREASONABLE
A scathing criticism of the real preachers of hate.
FRANZ SCHOENBERNER

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM
A penetrating analysis of America's responsibilities toward the peace.
WILLIAM AGAR

PROBLEMS FOR FRENCHMEN
A great French philosopher looks constructively at the future of France.
JACQUES MARITAIN

THOMAS MANN - GERALD HEARD
and other important writers.
Book Reviews by PEARL BUCK, KATHLEEN COYLE, and others. KATHERINE WOODS, editor and contributor.

SEPTEMBER FIRST
On All Newsstands
25c

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He writes as if the colonists existed only to be governed. He tells nothing—or practically nothing—of the social, economic and cultural impulses to independence in America or to empire in England. Imperial restrictions upon the expansion of American capitalism hardly engage his attention. The threat of American free enterprise to British mercantilism is equally slighted.

In retrospect it appears that perhaps the profoundest differences between the Americans and the English were in their attitudes toward the West. Here was continental opportunity beckoning the colonists. But here also was ruin for British merchants who, lest their markets disappear beyond the mountains, had to restrict settlement to the coastal plain. We do not insist upon this thesis, though it was adumbrated by Clarence Alvord more than twenty-five years ago, ably refined by Louis Hacker much more recently, and placed neatly in the whole revolutionary pattern more recently still by Curtis Nettels. No one has successfully challenged this thesis, though others have been offered to supplement it. Professor Miller does not even nod to any of them. His eyes, blinded by the dust in the British Museum and the Public Record Office, could not see the illumination that was shining outside. He hunted for new phrases to dress up ideas much older than himself, but those ideas were already as dead as Washington and George III. Long ago these stalwarts must have stopped laughing at those ideas. It is time we began to laugh.

This volume has been selected by the Book-of-the-Month Club. It is good to see the Club encourage professional scholars. Sad that its amateur selectors can't tell fire from ashes.

WILLIAM MILLER

Reticent Curmudgeon

Fightin' Oil, by Harold L. Ickes. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 174 pages. $1.75.

IT IS SAFE TO ASSUME that anyone as busy as Mr. Ickes would not take time out to write this little book without good reason. The public, as well as certain high officials in Washington, and even a few prominent men in the oil industry itself still seem to be befuddled over the necessity of stringent rationing of gasoline and fuel oil, and such questions as the shortage of crude and the difficulties of transportation versus pleasing the public by easing up on vacation riding.

Much of the book is written in Mr. Ickes' pungent and vigorous style and with much real humor, for which he is not so famous. One suspects that the forthrightness of Mr. Ickes has been no small factor in his winning the respect and even admiration of the petroleum fraternity with whom he has been working so closely, particularly since shortly before Pearl Harbor.

Only a little more than a year ago, sensational charges were being made by a member of the Department of Justice and a few members of Congress against the largest of the oil companies. It is interesting, therefore, to read the praise which Mr. Ickes bestrows on the oil industry. The author notes that "the American petroleum industry has placed at the disposal of its country all of the benefits of its chemical research in which it has spent, according to some estimates, four billion dollars." Speaking of the war effort of the industry, he also states, "It has required a wholesale shift in the supply relationships as between companies, and, had it not been for the most careful planning and the skillful execution of the plans, complete chaos would undoubtedly have resulted. In no other country except America, and in my opinion, in few other industries, could a coöperative undertaking of such gigantic proportions work successfully." Mr. Ickes, in setting up his administrative organization, appointed men experienced in every branch of the oil industry.

Probably the most important statement in the book is the following, "The relationship now existing between the government and the petroleum industry demonstrates beyond dispute that government and industry can work together, although it has taken a war to prove it. . . . We have issued no fiat or ukase, no dictatorship exists or impends."

The Petroleum Administrator early foresaw the need of additional pipelines to the East Coast. "With my usual hangdog reticence when I am worried by public affairs, I began to air my fears. Perhaps I would have been better off personally to have let nature take its course. All that I did for the time being was to bring down on my head the maledictions and anathemas of the millions of people who wouldn't agree with me because they didn't want to, and the thousands of newspapers that thought it a heaven-sent opportunity to bump off an enemy of long standing. But having gone out on the limb, I saw nothing to be gained by crawling back, especially since the longer I remained out there looking about me, the more certain I became that I wasn't just seeing spots. I suggested timidly, as is my wont, that to play safe we ought to build a few pipe lines."

In the chapter on "Oil in the Ground" the author discusses the shortage of crude, as distinguished from transportation bottlenecks. In this chapter, the author strongly supports the views which this reviewer set forth in 1936 regarding the then probable shortage of crude. But the general public had long been fed the idea of unlimited reserves and always-find-it-when-we-want-it. As Mr. Ickes notes, "Frankly the oil industry is itself largely responsible for this public attitude." It might have been a little more accurate to lay this blame on certain publicity organizations speaking for the industry rather than the industry itself.

BENJAMIN T. BROOKS

In Tolerance

History of Bigotry in the United States, by Gustavus Myers. New York: Random House. 495 pages. $3.50.

THIS IS the kind of history which collects, assorts and displays facts without reference to their meaning. It may be dull, but it can be useful under three conditions:

The first condition is that the facts happen to be about some agency of social change which explains other agencies but which is itself not so much in need of explanation. This is more true of the accumulation of great fortunes than of the fluctuations of bigotry; for the existence of bigotry and its choice of object depend much more upon other features of a society.

Second, if new facts can be gathered within a few volumes, diligent fact-finding can turn out a Definitive Refer-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ence. This book is not within this category; indeed, for many of the topics considered, there exist very good monographs to which Myers, in his prideful mania for exclusively primary sources, does not refer.

Third, if the facts compiled are about some topic that is commonly neglected and yet important to some public, the fact-finder can succeed by letting indubitable sources "speak for themselves." Myers' "History of Great American Fortunes" was beautifully timed in this way: it linked the indignation of muckraking with the diligence of scholarship. These conditions explain how the same man could write the successful "Great American Fortunes" in 1907, and the "History of Bigotry" in 1943.

Most of the bigotry Myers examines is bigotry organized against some religion, yet he does not search out the ramifications of this problem, especially in the political and economic realms. Neither tolerance nor bigotry is ever practised at the same time in all spheres. If Locke advocated tolerance in "matters of mere religion," he was bigoted to the point of advocating the use of force in matters pertaining to the "possession of all outward goods." As any sphere comes under the control of an interest and is thought necessary to its privileges, its members become intolerant about beliefs and practices in that sphere.

When the intricacies of bigotry are not clearly conceived, the term can be used as a smear merely by selection of cases. The object of those bigotries the author selects—Catholicism, Semitism, racism—do not include any to which liberals would object. Yet surely bigotry is not confined to people connected with "bad causes." Bigotry, says Webster, "is obstinate and blind attachment to some creed, opinion, practice or ritual." All faith, then tends toward bigotry; and the more alive and powerful a religious organization, the more bigoted. Religions do not often act out their latent bigotry now because they are afraid they couldn't get away with it.

The problem coming out of reflections on intolerance is less to explain bigotry than to grasp at the character of those privileged epochs and spheres which permit tolerance: If men don't really care about the issues at stake, they are tolerant. That is, of course, as it should be. By examining what men are bigoted about you find out what really matters to them. When men believe that only their enemies have the power to be successful bigots they see the value of tolerance. Two religions, each claiming to monopolize the only toll bridge to salvation, will tolerate each other if they are persuaded that they cannot destroy each other.

The toleration of contradictory opinion must be distinguished from the forebearance of threatening practice: such opinion will be tolerated by those who do not expect it to be translated into such practice. This means that those who are thought to be less powerful may be the more readily tolerated. A status quo may absorb new threats by the cynical opportunity of kindly tolerance and skillful compromise. In conversation, too, the politely nodding head of tolerance may hide timid ignorance and that genial hypocrisy which is the very death of thought.

Principles are often expressions of those operations which have been proved to be expedient, and tolerance is usually invoked as a principle by those who find themselves in these expediencies. Other situations require that men look before they leap while remembering that nobody ever gets wet by looking—unless somebody splashes them by leaping in first.

C. WRIGHT MILLS

OVERSEAS
Reconstruction Training

to develop personnel for the field of economic rehabilitation of Jews and refugees.

The World ORT Union will grant scholarships in leading American educational institutions.

Applicants with experience in administration, law, engineering, adult and vocational education, community organization, foreign residence or mastery of foreign languages will be given preference.

Evening sessions; New York City
Bulletin on Request
ORT UNION, 212 5TH Ave. N.Y.

LANGUAGES

BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet B. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st Street, New York City.

The special classified rate of THE NEW REPUBLIC is 50c a type line for 6 point type (6 words to the line), and 45c a type line for 5 point type (7 words to the line). Minimum ad is three lines. Advertising Department.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.

Camp UNITY
Wingdale, N. Y. on Lake Ellis

Camp Open Until September 19
★ FOR VACATION FUN
All Sports ★ Tasty Food ★ Sparkling Entertainment
★ SOCIAL STAFF OF 20
$30 A WEEK $5.50 PER DAY
SERVICE MEN IN UNIFORM - $25 A WEEK
Make Reservations Now at
NEW YORK OFFICE 1 Union Sq., West ALgonquin 4-8024

OUR MEN NEED ★ BOOKS ★

SEND ALL YOU CAN SPARE

That book you've enjoyed — pass it along to a man in uniform. Leave it at the nearest collection center or public library for the 1943

★
VICTORY BOOK CAMPAIGN

HILLTOP LODGE
ON BEAUTIFUL SYLVAN LAKE
R. R. Sta., Pawling, N. Y.
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.
Only 65 Miles from New York City
Every Sport & Recreation • Golf Free
F. Wolfson & S. Rothauser, Directors
N. Y. Office: 277 Broadway • CO 7-3958

A VACATION HAVEN 40 MILES FROM N. Y.
Birdland
CENTRAL VALLEY N. Y.
Formerly Lewisohn's Estate OPEN ALL YEAR
225-acre estate of fascinating hiking country. Tennis, Swimming, Golf, Handball, Bicycles, Ping-pong, Games, recordings, library, dancing. Excellent cuisine. Every comfort. Incomparable surroundings. Adults. Tel.: Highland Mills 7895. Hostess: FANNIE GOLDBERG

Extra Special for Labor Day Week-End
25 Exhilarating Sports. Inviting Accommodations. Zestful Dining. Entertainment—Grand Company. No car needed. N. Y., Ontario & Western R.R., The Short Line & Mountain Buses—Now Added: 3 Trains on the Erie. Private door-to-door hacking service. Attractive Rates Throughout the Summer. SPECIAL DISCOUNT TO MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM.
CHESTERS' ZUNBARG
Woodbourne, N. Y. Tel. Woodbourne 1150

VERMONT VACATION

RESTFUL, country living with small group. Beautiful surroundings, $22-26 week. Write to Beland Gray. Ethan Allen Farm, RFD No. 2, Chester, Vermont.

Opening Thursday, Sept. 2nd
Modern Play Productions, Inc., presents
FAMILIAR PATTERN NEW COMEDY DRAMA
by DAVID S. LIFSON
Seats $2.20. Thereafter $.85, $1.10, $1.65
Curtain at 8:30
PROVINCETOWN PLAYHOUSE
133 MacDougal St., N. Y. GRamercy 7-9894

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Reader's List

PLANNING: POVERTY AND PROGRESS IN CHINA. No. 209 (Available through The New Republic, 25 cents). This pamphlet deals with the poverty, war-time changes and post-war industrialization of China. The lack of good roads has been the greatest cause and consequence of her material backwardness; it has meant famine in one area and overabundance in another; it has been an obstacle to centralized government and to the industrialization of the interior. As a result of the war, the government has undertaken the heavy industries and has gradually assumed control of the price and distribution of essential materials, while Chinese Industrial Coöperatives have established a chain of light industries. Foreign investments after the war can be of benefit only in the elimination of political intervention and exploitation and should be on a profit-sharing basis. Technical assistance in the form of scholarships should be as available as foreign capital. China's present national unity has been achieved in a mere decade—its continuance depends on the coöperation of other democratic countries.

A TREE GROWS IN BROOKLYN, by Betty Smith (Harper's, $2.75). This is a sentimental story about the poor but honest Nolan family who live in the tenements of Williamsburg, Brooklyn. Johnny Nolan, the father, is the happy-go-lucky Irish singing waiter who loves his family dearly, yet spends his tips (unknown to his wife) on liquor. Katie is the long suffering, meek wife who cheerfully scrubs floors to support the family, and defends her husband against the cruel world. Francie is the sensitive daughter who loves school and dreams of going to college—naturally, she gets there. Neeley, the son, has his father's handsomeness and a voice to match. Of course, Johnny dies—shh, a drunkard's death, but it's put down as pneumonia; and after Johnny fades out, a good and dependable man comes along to marry Katie. Miss Smith's best character is Aunt Sissy who marries several men without the formality of divorce and calls all her husbands John. This novel is going to be a whopping success (it's a Literary Guild selection) and the movie version—with the rather weak rape scene deleted—should guarantee a good emotional jag to all comers.

GRAND CROSSING, by Alexander Saxton (Harpers, $2.50). A sober, at times indeed pedestrian, first novel of the coming of age of one Michael Reed who leaves a rather social and literary existence at Harvard for a semi-proletarian education at the University of Chicago and environs. The New Yorker feels that Mr. Saxton "has more to learn about life than about writing." Quite the contrary: Mr. Saxton has a pretty good idea of what life is all about, thank you, but his next time out we hope that he'll tell us about it with fewer and better words.

REMEMBER GREECE, by Dilys Powell (Hastings House, $2). The story of the courage and indomitable spirit of the Greeks in the face of inevitable failure to keep their independence is told in a charmingly personal manner by a woman who had lived in Athens since 1926. The first section of the book deals with the Greco-Italian war, the second, with the Axis occupation, while the third offers a kind of telescopic view of Greece: historical, geographical and sociological. Miss Powell relates vividly the depressing tales of hundreds of Lidices—such as the complete destruction of Doxatos—of massacres and famines; but bright and encouraging are the stories of the many bands of guerrillas hidden in the mountains who swoop down to destroy bridges and derail trains. Perhaps the most ironic and humiliating experience to the Greeks, who had defeated the Italians in Albania, was to find themselves handed over to an Italian army of occupation. This book should be read by all who are interested in the struggle of a small nation against fascism.

THE STORY OF THE AMERICAS: The Discovery, Settlement and Development of the New World, by Leland Dewitt Baldwin (Simon and Schuster, $3.50). This history is an informal and clearly written account of the expanding frontiers in the Western hemisphere from the voyages of Columbus to Pearl Harbor. Mr. Baldwin's book is a layman's introduction to the explorations, revolutions and rival imperialisms which make up the complex and fascinating story of the two Americas. Although he devotes a few chapters to the transcontinental movements in Anglo-America, well over two-thirds of his volume deals with the less familiar history of Hispanic America. Physiographic, racial and political causes have accounted for the glaring differences in the histories of the two continents, but the author cites certain common interests which can ultimately create a lasting hemispheric solidarity.

ONE OF OUR PILOTS IS SAFE, by William Simpson (Harpers, $2.50). This is the story of a British bomber pilot whose plane was shot down in Belgium on the day the Germans launched their invasion of the Low Countries and France. Before his crew mates could drag him from the cockpit, Captain Simpson was so badly burned that for many months he lay between life and death. His book is a simple, honest account of the crash which cost him most of his fingers and half of his face, his experiences in various French army hospitals and his eventual repatriation to England. It is a gripping and terrible story: readers with queasy stomachs should avoid it.

Contributors

ROBERT C. COOK is editor of the Journal of Heredity and lives in Washington, D. C.

ALBERT GUÉRARD, a member of the faculty of Stanford University, is the author of several books on French civilization which include "France of Tomorrow," published last year, and "Napoleon III: An Interpretation," just published by Harvard University.

WILLSON WHITMAN is a newspaper woman and an occasional contributor to The New Republic.

SIDNEY HOOK is a professor of Philosophy at New York University. His latest book is "The Hero in History: A Study in Limitation and Possibility," published last spring by John Day.

HENRY LEE MOON has been an assistant to the secretary of Tuskegee Institute and an editorial writer on negro newspapers in Cleveland, Ohio, and New York City. At present he is a Racial Relations adviser for a federal agency, and has contributed to The Nation, The New York Times, Phylon, Opportunity, The Crisis and The New Republic.

WILLIAM MILLER is co-author with Thomas C. Cochran of "The Age of Enterprise: A Social History of Industrial America," published last fall by Macmillan.

BENJAMIN T. BROOKS has been associated with the petroleum industry since 1912, first as a research chemist and later as consulting chemical engineer. In 1940-41 he was special adviser on petroleum matters to the government of Venezuela and in 1942 was appointed by the State Department to assist in the settlement of the oil expropriation controversy with Mexico.

C. WRIGHT MILLS is an associate professor of Sociology at the University of Maryland.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED